arXiv:1505.01307v4 [math.AG] 5 Jan 2016

On Noetherian schemes over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and the category of quasi-coherent sheaves

Abhishek Banerjee

Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques, Le Bois-Marie 35, route de Chartres, 91440, Bures-sur-Yvette, France. Email: abhishekbanerjee1313@gmail.com.

Abstract

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ be an abelian symmetric monoidal category satisfying certain conditions and let X be a scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ in the sense of Toën and Vaquié. In this paper we show that when X is quasi-compact and semi-separated, any quasi-coherent sheaf on X may be expressed as a directed colimit of its finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules. Thereafter, we introduce a notion of "field objects" in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ that satisfy several properties similar to those of fields in usual commutative algebra. Finally we show that the points of a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme X over such a field object K in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ can be recovered from certain kinds of functors between categories of quasi-coherent sheaves. The latter is a partial generalization of some recent results of Brandenburg and Chirvasitu.

MSC(2010) Subject classification: 14A15, 19D23.

1 Introduction

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ be an abelian symmetric monoidal category satisfying certain conditions. Then, the idea of doing algebraic geometry over the category $\mathcal{C}$ has been developed by several authors; see, for instance, Deligne [11], Hakim [18] and the work of Toën and Vaquié [35]. When $\mathcal{C} = k - Mod$, the category of modules over an ordinary commutative ring k, we recover the usual algebraic geometry of schemes over $Spec(k)$. In general, a more abstract theory of schemes (and monoid objects) using categories is the entry point to, for instance, the derived algebraic geometry of Lurie [22] and the homotopical algebraic geometry of Toën and Vezzosi (see [33], [34]). For an abstract treatment of monoid objects in abelian model categories, see, for instance Hovey [19]. Further, the Morita theory for monoids in symmetric monoidal categories has been developed by Vitale [37]. The algebraic geometry over symmetric monoidal categories is also a stepping stone to the study of schemes over "the field with one element" $\mathbb{F}_1$ (for more on the geometry over $\mathbb{F}_1$, we refer the reader for example to the work of Connes and Consani [6], [7], [8], Deitmar [10] and Soulé [30], [31]). In the last few years, there has also been a lot of interest in the theory of monoid schemes (see Cortiñas, Haesemeyer, Walker and Weibel [9], Flores and Weibel [13], Pirashvili [24] and Vezzani [36]).

In this paper, we will work with the notion of a scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ due to Toën and Vaquié [35]. For most of this article, we will also assume that the abelian symmetric monoidal category $\mathcal{C}$ is also "locally finitely generated". The theory of locally finitely generated abelian categories has been studied extensively in the literature (see, for example, [15], [25], [26], [27], [32]). For a scheme X over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$, the purpose of this paper is to consider the following two questions on the category $QCoh(X)$ of quasi-coherent sheaves on X:

(Q1) For a scheme X over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$, can a quasi-coherent sheaf on X be expressed as a colimit of its finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules?

We show that when X is quasi-compact and semi-separated (in the sense of Definition 2.2), this is indeed true, i.e., any quasi-coherent sheaf on X can be expressed as a directed colimit of finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules (see Theorem 3.9). For ordinary schemes over a field, similar results have been studied in the classical texts (see EGA I [16], [17]). More recently, Rydh [28], [29] has tackled similar questions for algebraic stacks.

The second question we consider in this paper concerns the points of a scheme over a "field object" K in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. In Definition 4.4, we have introduced a notion of "field objects" in the symmetric monoidal category $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ that we believe is of independent interest. It is shown that for a field object K over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$, the category $K-Mod$ of K-modules satisfies several properties analogous to the category of vector spaces over a field. Thereafter, we ask the following question:

(Q2) For a scheme X over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$, under what conditions does a functor $F : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow QCoh(Spec(K)) = K-Mod$ to the category of K-modules correspond to a pullback $F \cong f^*$ by a morphism $f : Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$?

For a quasi-compact, semi-separated and Noetherian scheme X, we show that any cocontinuous, symmetric monoidal and normal functor $F : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K-Mod$ corresponds to a point of X over the field object K (see Theorems 5.12 and 5.13). The notion of a normal functor $F : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K-Mod$ introduced in Definition 5.5 from the category of quasi-coherent sheaves is an extension of the notion of normal functors between categories of modules in [37].

We now describe the structure of the paper in greater detail. We let $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ be the category of unital commutative monoid objects in $\mathcal{C}$. For any $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$, we let $A-Mod$ be the category of A-modules in $\mathcal{C}$. Then, we let $Aff_{\mathcal{C}} := Comm(\mathcal{C})^{op}$ be the category of affine schemes over $\mathcal{C}$. In particular, the affine scheme corresponding to a commutative monoid object $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ is denoted by $Spec(A)$. In Section 2, we briefly recall the notion of a scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ due to Toën and Vaquié [35]. We also recall from [1] and [4] the notion of quasi-coherent sheaf for schemes over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ as well as the corresponding formalism of pullback and pushforward functors. Thereafter, in Section 3, we assume that every object in $\mathcal{C}$ can be expressed as a directed colimit of finitely generated subobjects. We show that this is equivalent to every A-module M being isomorphic to the directed colimit of its finitely generated A-submodules. Then, the main result of Section 3 is the following (see Theorem 3.9).

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a quasi-coherent sheaf on X. Then, $\mathcal{M}$ can be expressed as a filtered direct limit of its finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules.*

We start considering Noetherian schemes in Section 4. We say that a commutative monoid object A is Noetherian if every finitely generated A-module M is finitely presented, i.e., can be expressed as a colimit

$$M \cong colim(0 \longleftarrow A^m \xrightarrow{q} A^n) \tag{1.1}$$

for some morphism $q : A^m \longrightarrow A^n$ with $m, n \geq 1$ (see Definition 4.1). Then, our first result is that if A is a Noetherian commutative monoid object, $Spec(A)$ is a Noetherian scheme, i.e., if $A \longrightarrow B$ is a morphism in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ inducing a Zariski open immersion $Spec(B) \longrightarrow Spec(A)$ of affine schemes, $B \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ must also be Noetherian (see Proposition 4.3). The key notion in Section 4 is that of a "field object": we say that a Noetherian commutative monoid object $0 \neq K \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ is a "field object" in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ if it has no subobjects other than 0 and K in $K - Mod$ (see Definition 4.4). We believe that this notion is of independent interest and hope that it would be a first step towards developing Galois theory for schemes over a symmetric monoidal category. In order to justify our definition as the correct notion for a field in a symmetric monoidal category, the rest of Section 4 is devoted to showing that the category $K - Mod$ of modules over a field object K has several properties similar to the category of vector spaces over a field. We prove the following succession of results on $K - Mod$, each property being utilized to prove the next.

Theorem 1.2. *Let K be a field object in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ in the sense of Definition 4.4. Then, we show the following:*

(a) For any $n \geq 1$, K^n is a projective object of $K - Mod$ and any morphism of finitely presented K-modules can be lifted to a morphism of their presentations.

(b) Every monomorphism (resp. epimorphism) in $K - Mod$ is a split monomorphism (resp. split epimorphism).

(c) Any finitely generated (non-zero) K-module is isomorphic to a direct sum K^m for some $m \geq 1$.

(d) The corresponding affine scheme $Spec(K)$ behaves in a way similar to a space with a single point, i.e., any non-trivial Zariski open immersion $U \longrightarrow Spec(K)$ must be an isomorphism.

Finally, given a Noetherian commutative monoid object A such that $Hom_{A-Mod}(A, A)$ is an integral domain, we describe in Proposition 4.11 a process of localizing A (under some conditions) to obtain a field object $K(A)$ in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. This is the analogue of the usual contruction of the field of fractions of an integral domain.

In Section 5, we consider the points of a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme X over a field object K, i.e., morphisms $f : Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$. It is clear that any such morphism f defines a pullback functor $f^* : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow QCoh(Spec(K)) = K - Mod$ that is cocontinuous (i.e., preserves small colimits) and preserves the symmetric monoidal structure. As such, it is natural to ask if the converse is true, i.e., whether any cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functor $F : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K - Mod$ can be described as $F \cong f^*$ for some morphism $f : Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$. For usual schemes, Brandenburg and Chirvasitu [5] have shown that this is indeed the case. In fact, it is shown in [5] that any cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functor $F : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow QCoh(Y)$ with X being a quasi-compact and quasi-separated scheme can be described as a pullback along some morphism $f : Y \longrightarrow X$. Let A, B be commutative monoid objects of $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ with A Noetherian. Then, if $F : A - Mod \longrightarrow B - Mod$ is a functor that is not only cocontinuous and symmetric monoidal but also normal in the sense of Vitale [37, § 4], we show in Proposition 5.2 that F corresponds to "extension of scalars" along some morphism $A \longrightarrow B$ in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$. This suggests that we should introduce a suitable notion of normal functor from $QCoh(X)$ to $K - Mod$. This is done in Definition 5.5. Then, the main result of Section 5 is the following (see Theorems 5.12 and 5.13).

Theorem 1.3. *Let X be a quasi-compact, semi-separated and Noetherian scheme over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$. Let K be a field object of $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ and $F : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K-Mod$ be a cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functor that is also normal. Then, there exists a morphism $f : Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$ such that $F \cong f^*$.*

Conversely, the pullback functor $f^* : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K-Mod$ corresponding to a morphism $f : Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$ is not only cocontinuous and symmetric monoidal, but also a normal functor in the sense of Definition 5.5.

As indicated above, from Section 3 onwards, we will assume that the category $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ is "locally finitely generated". As such, we present here some natural examples of situations where this condition applies.

Examples: (a) If Y is a topological space and $\mathcal{A}$ is a presheaf of commutative rings on Y, we could take $\mathcal{C}$ to be the category $\mathcal{A}-Premod$ of presheaves of $\mathcal{A}$-modules on Y (see [26, Corollary 2.15]).

(b) Further, if Y is any topological space with a basis of compact open sets (for example, any locally Noetherian space) and $\mathcal{A}$ is any sheaf of commutative rings on Y, the category $\mathcal{A}-Mod$ of sheaves of $\mathcal{A}$-modules on Y is also locally finitely generated (see [25, Theorem 3.5]). In fact, in cases (a) and (b), the categories $\mathcal{A}-Premod$ and $\mathcal{A}-Mod$ respectively satisfy an even stronger condition, i.e., they are actually "locally finitely presented" (see [25], [26]).

(c) If Y is the closed unit interval $[0,1]$ with the usual topology and $\mathcal{A}_Y$ is the sheaf of continuous real-valued functions on Y, the category $\mathcal{A}_Y-Mod$ of sheaves of $\mathcal{A}_Y$-modules on Y is also locally finitely generated (see [25, Proposition 5.5]).

In this paper, given any symmetric monoidal categories $(C,\otimes,1_C)$ and $(D,\otimes,1_D)$, a functor $F : C \longrightarrow D$ will be said to be symmetric monoidal if it preserves the symmetric monoidal structures up to canonical isomorphism. Additionally, all the symmetric monoidal categories in this paper will be $\mathbb{Z}$-linear (i.e., preadditive) and therefore we will only speak of symmetric monoidal functors between them that are also $\mathbb{Z}$-linear.

2 Quasi-coherent sheaves on schemes over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$

In this section as well as in the rest of this paper, we let $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ denote an abelian symmetric monoidal category that contains all small limits and colimits. Further, we will assume that $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ is closed; in other words, given any objects X, $Y \in \mathcal{C}$, there exists an internal hom object $\underline{Hom}(X,Y) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that we have natural isomorphisms:

$$Hom(Z \otimes X, Y) \cong Hom(Z, \underline{Hom}(X,Y)) \qquad \forall\ Z \in \mathcal{C} \tag{2.1}$$

Let $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ denote the category of commutative monoid objects in $\mathcal{C}$. If $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ is such a commutative monoid, we let $A-Mod$ denote the category of A-module objects in $\mathcal{C}$. Then, it follows that $(A-Mod,\otimes_A,A)$ is also a closed abelian symmetric monoidal category (see Vitale [37]). For any M, $N \in A-Mod$, we will denote by $\underline{Hom}_A(M,N)$ the internal hom object in $A-Mod$. Additionally, we will assume that filtered colimits commute with finite limits in each $A-Mod$.

Let $Aff_{\mathcal{C}} := Comm(\mathcal{C})^{op}$ be the category of affine schemes over $\mathcal{C}$. Given a commutative monoid object $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$, we let $Spec(A)$ denote the affine scheme corresponding to A. Then, Toën and Vaquié [35, Définition 2.10] have introduced the notion of Zariski coverings in $Aff_{\mathcal{C}}$ making $Aff_{\mathcal{C}}$ into a subcanonical Grothendieck site. Accordingly, we let $Sh(Aff_{\mathcal{C}})$ be the category of sheaves of sets on $Aff_{\mathcal{C}}$. Further, Toën and Vaquié have also introduced a notion of Zariski open immersions in the category $Sh(Aff_{\mathcal{C}})$ (see [35, Définition 2.12]) that is stable under composition and base change. We now recall from [35, Définition 2.15] the notion of a scheme over the symmetric monoidal category $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$.

Definition 2.1. *Let X be an object of $Sh(Aff_{\mathcal{C}})$. Then, X is said to be a scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ if there exists a family $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ of affine schemes over $\mathcal{C}$ along with a morphism:*

$$p : \coprod_{i\in I} X_i \longrightarrow X \tag{2.2}$$

satisfying the following two conditions:
(1) The morphism p is an epimorphism in the category $Sh(Aff_{\mathcal{C}})$.
(2) For each $i \in I$, the morphism $X_i \longrightarrow X$ is a Zariski open immersion in the category $Sh(Aff_{\mathcal{C}})$.

A collection of morphisms $\{X_i \longrightarrow X\}_{i\in I}$ as in (2.2) is said to be an affine cover of the scheme X. Given a scheme X over $\mathcal{C}$, we denote by $ZarAff(X)$ the category of Zariski open immersions $U \longrightarrow X$ with U affine. By definition (see [35, Définition 2.10]), a collection $\{U_i = Spec(A_i) \longrightarrow Spec(A)\}_{i\in I}$ of Zariski open immersions is said to be a covering of $Spec(A)$ if there exists a finite subset $J \subseteq I$ such that a morphism $f : M \longrightarrow N$ in $A - Mod$ is an isomorphism if and only if the induced morphism $f_j := f \otimes_A A_j : M \otimes_A A_j \longrightarrow N \otimes_A A_j$ is an isomorphism for each $j \in J$.

Definition 2.2. *Let X be a scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. We will say that X is quasi-compact if every affine cover of X has a finite subcover.*

Further, we will say that X is semi-separated if the fiber product $U \times_X V \in ZarAff(X)$ for any U, $V \in ZarAff(X)$.

From the above, it is clear that for any commutative monoid object A, the affine scheme $Spec(A)$ is quasi-compact and semi-separated. Further, a scheme X over $\mathcal{C}$ determines a functor:

$$\mathcal{O}_X : ZarAff(X)^{op} \longrightarrow Comm(\mathcal{C}) \qquad (U = Spec(A) \longrightarrow X) \mapsto A \tag{2.3}$$

In [1], we introduced the notion of a quasi-coherent sheaf on a scheme X over $\mathcal{C}$. For this, we consider the category $Mod_{\mathcal{C}}$ whose objects are pairs (A, M) where $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ and $M \in A - Mod$. A morphism $(f, f_\sharp) : (A, M) \longrightarrow (B, N)$ in $Mod_{\mathcal{C}}$ consists of a morphism $f : A \longrightarrow B$ in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ along with a morphism $f_\sharp : B \otimes_A M \longrightarrow N$ of B-modules.

Definition 2.3. *(see [1, Definition 2.2]) Let X be a scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. A quasi-coherent sheaf $\mathcal{M}$ on X is a functor*

$$\mathcal{M} : ZarAff(X)^{op} \longrightarrow Mod_{\mathcal{C}} \tag{2.4}$$

satisfying the following two conditions:

(1) If p denotes the obvious projection $p : Mod_{\mathcal{C}} \longrightarrow Comm(\mathcal{C})$, we have $p \circ \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_X$.
(2) For any morphism $u : U' \longrightarrow U$ in $ZarAff(X)$, let $\mathcal{M}(U) = (\mathcal{O}_X(U), M)$ and $\mathcal{M}(U') = (\mathcal{O}_X(U'), M')$. Then, the morphism $\mathcal{M}(u)_\sharp : \mathcal{O}_X(U') \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} M \longrightarrow M'$ is an isomorphism.

When there is no danger of confusion, for any $U \in ZarAff(X)$, we will often use $\mathcal{M}(U)$ simply to denote the $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$-module corresponding to $\mathcal{M}(U) \in Mod_{\mathcal{C}}$. The category of quasi-coherent sheaves over X will be denoted by $QCoh(X)$.

Given a scheme X, it is easy to see that $QCoh(X)$ becomes a symmetric monoidal category by setting:

$$(\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N})(U) := \mathcal{M}(U) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} \mathcal{N}(U) \qquad \forall\, U \in ZarAff(X) \tag{2.5}$$

for every $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{N} \in QCoh(X)$. Let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a morphism of schemes over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. We will say that f is quasi-compact if for each $V \in ZarAff(Y)$ and $U := V \times_Y X$, every affine covering $\{U_j \longrightarrow U\}_{j \in J}$ of U has a finite subcover. Further, we will say that $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is semi-separated if for each $V \in ZarAff(Y)$, $U := V \times_Y X$ and U_1, $U_2 \in ZarAff(U)$, the fiber product $U_1 \times_U U_2 \in ZarAff(U)$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a morphism of schemes over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Then:*

(a) There exists a pullback functor $f^* : QCoh(Y) \longrightarrow QCoh(X)$ along with natural isomorphisms $f^*(\mathcal{M}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} f^*(\mathcal{N}) \cong f^*(\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{N})$ for $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{N} \in QCoh(Y)$.

(b) If f is quasi-compact and semi-separated, then there exists a pushforward $f_* : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow QCoh(Y)$ that is right adjoint to the pullback f^*.

(c) For any $\mathcal{M}'$, $\mathcal{N}' \in QCoh(X)$, there are natural morphisms $f_*(\mathcal{M}') \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} f_*(\mathcal{N}') \longrightarrow f_*(\mathcal{M}' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N}')$.

Proof. (a) Let $\{Y_i \longrightarrow Y\}_{i \in I}$ be an affine covering of Y. For each $i \in I$, set $X_i := X \times_Y Y_i$ and let $\{U_{ij} \longrightarrow X_i\}_{j \in J_i}$ be an affine covering of X_i. Then, the functor $f^* : QCoh(Y) \longrightarrow QCoh(X)$, as defined in [4, Proposition 2.6] is determined by setting $f^*(\mathcal{M})(U_{ij}) := \mathcal{M}(Y_i) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(Y_i)} \mathcal{O}_X(U_{ij})$ for each $j \in J_i$, $i \in I$. It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{N})(U_{ij}) &\cong (\mathcal{M}(Y_i) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(Y_i)} \mathcal{O}_X(U_{ij})) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U_{ij})} (\mathcal{N}(Y_i) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(Y_i)} \mathcal{O}_X(U_{ij})) \\ &\cong f^*(\mathcal{M})(U_{ij}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U_{ij})} f^*(\mathcal{N})(U_{ij}) \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Part (b) is already shown in [4, Proposition 2.4] and [4, Proposition 2.6]. Finally, for (c), we consider the counit morphisms $f^*f_*(\mathcal{M}') \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}'$, $f^*f_*(\mathcal{N}') \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}'$ given by the adjoint pair (f^*, f_*). Using (a), we know that $(f^*f_*(\mathcal{M}')) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} (f^*f_*(\mathcal{N}')) \cong f^*(f_*(\mathcal{M}') \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} f_*(\mathcal{N}'))$ and hence we have a morphism $f^*(f_*(\mathcal{M}') \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} f_*(\mathcal{N}')) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N}'$. Again, since f^* is left adjoint to f_*, this gives us a natural morphism: $f_*(\mathcal{M}') \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} f_*(\mathcal{N}') \longrightarrow f_*(\mathcal{M}' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N}')$.

□

From Proposition 2.4, it follows that, in the language of [23, XI.2], $f^* : QCoh(Y) \longrightarrow QCoh(X)$ is a "strong tensor functor" between the symmetric monoidal categories $QCoh(Y)$ and $QCoh(X)$ whereas $f_* : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow QCoh(Y)$ is a "lax tensor functor" (if f is quasi-compact and semi-separated). Further, since f^* is a left adjoint, it preserves colimits, in other words, $f^* : QCoh(Y) \longrightarrow$

$QCoh(X)$ is a cocontinuous functor. In particular, if X is a scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ that is semi-separated in the sense of Definition 2.2, we note that for any $U \in ZarAff(X)$, the Zariski open immersion $i : U \longrightarrow X$ is quasi-compact and semi-separated. We now have the following result.

Proposition 2.5. *Let X be a semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Let $i : U \longrightarrow X$ be a Zariski open immersion that is quasi-compact and semi-separated. Then, the counit natural transformation $i^*i_* \longrightarrow 1$ is an isomorphism of functors $i^*i_* \cong 1 : QCoh(U) \longrightarrow QCoh(U)$. In particular, this is true for $(i : U \longrightarrow X) \in ZarAff(X)$.*

Proof. We consider some $\mathcal{M} \in QCoh(U)$. Then, since i is quasi-compact and semi-separated, we have $i_*\mathcal{M} \in QCoh(X)$. Then, as in the proof of Proposition 2.4(a), $i^*i_*\mathcal{M} \in QCoh(U)$ is determined by the modules:

$$(i^*i_*\mathcal{M})(W) := (i_*\mathcal{M})(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(W) \qquad \forall\ V \in ZarAff(X),\ W \in ZarAff(V \times_X U) \tag{2.7}$$

Since i is quasi-compact, we can choose a finite affine cover $\{W_i\}_{i \in I}$ of $i^{-1}(V) = V \times_X U$. Since $i^{-1}(V) = V \times_X U \longrightarrow V \longrightarrow X$ is a Zariski open immersion and hence a monomorphism, it follows that $(W_i \times_{i^{-1}(V)} W_{i'}) = W_i \times_V W_{i'} = W_i \times_X W_{i'}$ for any i, $i' \in I$. Then since X is semi-separated, $(W_i \times_{i^{-1}(V)} W_{i'}) = W_i \times_X W_{i'}$ is affine. Then, by definition of i_* (see [4, Proposition 2.4], we know that

$$(i_*\mathcal{M})(V) = lim \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}(W_i) \overset{\longrightarrow}{\longrightarrow} \prod_{i,i' \in I} \mathcal{M}(W_i \times_V W_{i'}) \right) \tag{2.8}$$

Combining with (2.7), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &(i^*i_*\mathcal{M})(W) \\ &= lim \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}(W_i) \overset{\longrightarrow}{\longrightarrow} \prod_{i,i' \in I} \mathcal{M}(W_i \times_V W_{i'}) \right) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(W) \\ &= lim \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}(W_i) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(W) \overset{\longrightarrow}{\longrightarrow} \prod_{i,i' \in I} \mathcal{M}(W_i \times_V W_{i'}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(W) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Additionally, for each $i \in I$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(W_i) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(W) &= \mathcal{M}(W_i) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(W_i)} (\mathcal{O}_X(W_i) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(W)) \\ &= \mathcal{M}(W_i) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(W_i)} \mathcal{O}_X(W_i \times_V W) = \mathcal{M}(W_i \times_V W) \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Similarly, for any i, $i' \in I$, we have:

$$\mathcal{M}(W_i \times_V W_{i'}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(W) = \mathcal{M}(W_i \times_V W_{i'} \times_V W) \tag{2.11}$$

Combining (2.9), (2.10) and (2.11), it follows that:

$$(i^*i_*\mathcal{M})(W) = lim \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}(W_i \times_V W) \overset{\longrightarrow}{\longrightarrow} \prod_{i,i' \in I} \mathcal{M}(W_i \times_V W_{i'} \times_V W) \right) \tag{2.12}$$

Finally, since $\{W_i \times_V W\}_{i \in I}$ is an affine cover of W, it follows from [35, Corollaire 2.11] that the limit in (2.12) is isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}(W)$. Hence, $i^*i_*\mathcal{M}(W) \cong \mathcal{M}(W)$ and the result follows. □

3 Colimits of finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules

In the usual algebraic geometry of schemes over $Spec(\mathbb{Z})$, it is a classical fact that a quasi-coherent sheaf on a noetherian scheme X is the union of its coherent subsheaves (see [16, Corollaire 9.4.9]). For schemes that are quasi-compact and quasi-separated, every quasi-coherent sheaf is a filtered direct colimit of finitely presented $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules (see [17, § 6.9]). Similar results are known for certain kinds of algebraic stacks (see [20, Proposition 15.4] and [28], [29]).

In this section, we will develop similar results for quasi-coherent sheaves on schemes over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$. Given a commutative monoid object $A\in Comm(\mathcal{C})$, we will say that an A-module M is finitely generated if it is finitely generated as an object of the category $A-Mod$. In other words, given any filtered system of monomorphisms $\{M_i\}_{i\in I}$ in $A-Mod$, we have an isomorphism:

$$colim_{i\in I}Hom_{A-Mod}(M,M_i)\xrightarrow{\cong}Hom_{A-Mod}(M,colim_{i\in I}M_i) \tag{3.1}$$

Let X be a quasi-compact scheme over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$. We will say that a quasi-coherent sheaf $\mathcal{M}$ on X is finitely generated if $\mathcal{M}(U)$ is finitely generated as an $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$-module for every $U\in ZarAff(X)$.

Proposition 3.1. *(a) Let $A\in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ be a commutative monoid object and let $M\in A-Mod$ be an A-module. Let $\{M_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a family (finite or infinite) of submodules of M. Then, there exists a submodule $\sum_{i\in I}M_i$ of M that is the "sum" of the family of submodules $\{M_i\}_{i\in I}$. In other words, the submodule $\sum_{i\in I}M_i$ satisfies the following two conditions:*

(1) For each $i\in I$, M_i is a submodule of $\sum_{i\in I}M_i$.

(2) Let N be a submodule of M containing M_i for every $i\in I$. Then, $\sum_{i\in I}M_i$ is a submodule of N.

(b) Let X be a scheme over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a quasi-coherent sheaf on X. Let $\{\mathcal{M}_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a family (finite or infinite) of quasi-coherent submodules of $\mathcal{M}$. Then, there exists a quasi-coherent submodule $\sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{M}_i$ of $\mathcal{M}$ that is the sum of the quasi-coherent submodules $\{\mathcal{M}_i\}_{i\in I}$.

Proof. (a) Since $A-Mod$ is an abelian category, it is well known that we can take sums of subobjects of any $M\in A-Mod$ (see, for instance, [14]). Explicitly, the sum $\sum_{i\in I}M_i$ may be described as follows: we consider the induced morphism $q:\bigoplus_{i\in I}M_i\longrightarrow M$. Then, the sum $\sum_{i\in I}M_i$ is defined to be the image of this morphism in the abelian category $A-Mod$; in other words, we set:

$$\begin{aligned}\textstyle\sum_{i\in I}M_i &:= Coker(Ker(q))=Coker(Ker(q:\textstyle\bigoplus_{i\in I}M_i\longrightarrow M)\longrightarrow\bigoplus_{i\in I}M_i)\\ &\cong Ker(Coker(q))=Ker(M\longrightarrow Coker(q:\textstyle\bigoplus_{i\in I}M_i\longrightarrow M))\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

(b) For any $U\in ZarAff(X)$, we set $(\sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{M}_i)(U):=\sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{M}_i(U)$. We consider a Zariski open immersion $W\longrightarrow U$ of affines. Then, $\mathcal{O}_X(W)$ is a flat $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$-module. Since the sum in (3.2) is defined in terms of colimits and finite limits, it now follows that $(\sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{M}_i)(W)=(\sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{M}_i)(U)\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}\mathcal{O}_X(W)$. Hence, $\sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{M}_i$ is a quasi-coherent submodule of $\mathcal{M}$ that is the sum of the submodules $\mathcal{M}_i$, $i\in I$.

□

Given an A-module M, we can consider the system of its finitely generated submodules ordered by inclusion. We will now show that this system is filtered.

Proposition 3.2. *(a) Let A be a commutative monoid object of $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ and let M be an A-module. Then, the system of finitely generated submodules of M ordered by inclusion is a filtered direct system.*

(b) Let X be a quasi-compact scheme over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a quasi-coherent sheaf on X. Then, the system of finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules of $\mathcal{M}$ is a filtered direct system.

Proof. (a) Let M_1, M_2 be two finitely generated submodules of M. We will show that M_1+M_2 is also finitely generated. For this, we choose a filtered direct system of monomorphisms $\{N_i\}_{i\in I}$ in $A-Mod$ and set $N = colim_{i\in I} N_i$. Since filtered colimits commute with finite limits in $A-Mod$, it follows that the canonical morphism $n_i : N_i \longrightarrow N$ is a monomorphism for each $i \in I$. We now choose a morphism $f : M_1 + M_2 \longrightarrow N$.

From (3.2), we know that there exists an epimorphism $q' : M_1 \oplus M_2 \longrightarrow M_1 + M_2$. It is clear that $M_1 \oplus M_2$ is finitely generated and hence the composition $f \circ q' : M_1 \oplus M_2 \longrightarrow N$ factors through N_{i_0} for some $i_0 \in I$. Further, we see that the composition

$$Ker(q') \longrightarrow M_1 \oplus M_2 \longrightarrow N_{i_0} \xrightarrow{n_{i_0}} N \tag{3.3}$$

is 0. Then, since $n_{i_0} : N_{i_0} \longrightarrow N$ is a monomorphism, the composition $Ker(q') \longrightarrow M_1 \oplus M_2 \longrightarrow N_{i_0}$ must be 0. Finally, since $M_1 + M_2 = Coker(Ker(q') \longrightarrow M_1 \oplus M_2)$, it follows that the morphism $f : M_1 + M_2 \longrightarrow N$ factors through N_{i_0}.

(b) For finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathcal{M}$, we consider the submodule $\mathcal{N}+\mathcal{P}$. From part (a) it follows that for each $U \in ZarAff(X)$, $(\mathcal{N}+\mathcal{P})(U) = \mathcal{N}(U) + \mathcal{P}(U)$ is a finitely generated submodule of $\mathcal{M}(U)$. This proves the result. □

Lemma 3.3. *(a) Let $f : A \longrightarrow B$ be a morphism in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$. Let M be a finitely generated A-module. Then, $M \otimes_A B$ is finitely generated as a B-module.*

(b) Suppose that every object of $\mathcal{C}$ can be expressed as a directed colimit of its finitely generated subobjects in $\mathcal{C}$. Then, for any $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$, every A-module can be expressed as a directed colimit of its finitely generated A-submodules.

Proof. (a) We consider a filtered system of monomorphisms $\{N_i\}_{i\in I}$ in $B-Mod$. Then, we have:

$$\begin{array}{l} \underset{i\in I}{colim}\ Hom_{B-Mod}(M\otimes_A B, N_i) \cong \underset{i\in I}{colim}\ Hom_{A-Mod}(M, N_i) \\ \cong Hom_{A-Mod}(M, \underset{i\in I}{colim}\ N_i) \cong Hom_{B-Mod}(M\otimes_A B, \underset{i\in I}{colim}\ N_i) \end{array} \tag{3.4}$$

This proves the result.

(b) Let M be an A-module. Then, we can express M as a directed colimit $M \cong \varinjlim_{i\in I} M_i$ of its finitely generated subobjects $\{M_i\}_{i\in I}$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Then, $\varinjlim_{i\in I} M_i \otimes A \xrightarrow{\cong} M \otimes A$. Let $m : M \otimes A \longrightarrow M$ be the morphism that makes M into an A-module. Now since the composition $M\otimes 1 \longrightarrow M\otimes A \xrightarrow{m} M$ is an isomorphism in $A-Mod$, $m : M\otimes A \longrightarrow M$ is an epimorphism and hence so is the composition $f : \varinjlim_{i\in I} M_i \otimes A \xrightarrow{\cong} M\otimes A \xrightarrow{m} M$. We now consider the canonical morphisms:

$$f_i : M_i \otimes A \longrightarrow \varinjlim_{i\in I} M_i \otimes A \xrightarrow{\cong} M\otimes A \xrightarrow{m} M \tag{3.5}$$

for each $i\in I$. For each $i\in I$, we also set M_i' to be the A-submodule $Im(f_i)$ of M. Since the colimit f of the morphisms $\{f_i\}_{i\in I}$ is an epimorphism, it is clear that $M\cong \varinjlim_{i\in I} M_i'$. From part (a), we know that since M_i is finitely generated in $\mathcal{C}$ (i.e, as a 1-module), $M_i\otimes A$ is finitely generated as an A-module. Further, since each M_i' is the image of the finitely generated A-module $M_i\otimes A$, it follows as in the proof of Proposition 3.2(a) that M_i' is finitely generated in $A-Mod$. Thus, the result follows.

□

Throughout this section and in the rest of this paper, we will make the following assumption on commutative monoid objects in $\mathcal{C}$:

(C1) Any object of $\mathcal{C}$ can be expressed as a directed colimit of its finitely generated subobjects in $\mathcal{C}$. Equivalently, for any commutative monoid $A\in Comm(\mathcal{C})$, any module $M\in A-Mod$ can be expressed as the directed colimit of its finitely generated submodules.

In other words, the condition (C1) says that the category $\mathcal{C}$ is "locally finitely generated". The theory of locally finitely generated abelian categories and indeed the theory of locally finitely generated Grothendieck categories is fairly well developed in the literature. For more on this, the reader may see, for example, [15], [25], [26], [27] or [32].

Lemma 3.4. *Let X be a quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a quasi-coherent sheaf on X. Then, if $\{U_j\}_{j\in J}$ is an affine Zariski cover of X such that $\mathcal{M}|_{U_j}$ is finitely generated over U_j for each $j\in J$, $\mathcal{M}$ is a finitely generated quasi-coherent sheaf on X.*

Proof. Since X is quasi-compact, we may suppose that $\{U_j = Spec(A_j)\}_{j\in J}$ is a finite affine cover. Then, $\mathcal{M}(U_j)$ is finitely generated as an A_j-module for each $j\in J$. We choose any $U = Spec(B)\in ZarAff(X)$. Further, since X is semi-separated, each $U\times_X U_j = Spec(B_j)$ is affine and the $Spec(B_j)$, $j\in J$ form a finite affine cover of $Spec(B)$. From Lemma 3.3(a), it follows that $\mathcal{M}_j := \mathcal{M}(U\times_X U_j) = \mathcal{M}(U_j)\otimes_{A_j} B_j$ is finitely generated as a B_j-module.

We now consider a filtered system of monomorphisms $\{N_i\}_{i\in I}$ in $B-Mod$ and a morphism $g : \mathcal{M}(U) \longrightarrow colim_{i\in I}\ N_i$ of B-modules. Since each B_j is flat as a B-module, $\{N_i\otimes_B B_j\}_{i\in I}$ is a filtered system of monomorphisms in B_j-Mod for each $j\in J$. Since $\mathcal{M}_j$ is a finitely generated B_j-module, J is finite and I is filtered, we can choose $i_0\in I$ such that $g\otimes_B B_j : \mathcal{M}_j = \mathcal{M}(U\times_X U_j) = \mathcal{M}(U)\otimes_B B_j \longrightarrow colim_{i\in I}N_i\otimes_B B_j$ factors through $N_{i_0}\otimes_B B_j$ for each $j\in J$. Further, since $N_{i_0}\otimes_B B_j \longrightarrow colim_{i\in I}N_i\otimes_B B_j$ is a monomorphism, the morphism $g\otimes_B B_j : \mathcal{M}_j = \mathcal{M}(U\times_X U_j) = \mathcal{M}(U)\otimes_B B_j \longrightarrow colim_{i\in I}N_i\otimes_B B_j$ factors uniquely through $N_{i_0}\otimes_B B_j$. Finally, since

$\{Spec(B_j) \longrightarrow Spec(B) = U\}_{j\in J}$ forms a finite affine cover, it follows from [35, Corollaire 2.11] that:

$$\begin{array}{r}\mathcal{M}(U) = lim\left(\prod_{j\in J}\mathcal{M}(U)\otimes_B B_j \rightrightarrows \prod_{j,j'\in J}\mathcal{M}(U)\otimes_B B_j\otimes_B B_{j'}\right)\\ N_{i_0} = lim\left(\prod_{j\in J}N_{i_0}\otimes_B B_j \rightrightarrows \prod_{j,j'\in J}N_{i_0}\otimes_B B_j\otimes_B B_{j'}\right)\end{array} \tag{3.6}$$

and hence the morphisms $\mathcal{M}(U)\otimes_B B_j \longrightarrow N_{i_0}\otimes_B B_j$ can be glued together to give a morphism $\mathcal{M}(U)\longrightarrow N_{i_0}$.

□

Lemma 3.5. *Let U be a scheme over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ that is also quasi-compact. Let $\mathcal{N}$ be a finitely generated quasi-coherent sheaf on U. Suppose that $\mathcal{N}$ can be expressed as a filtered colimit $\mathcal{N} = \varinjlim_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\mathcal{N}_\lambda$ of quasi-coherent submodules $\mathcal{N}_\lambda$. Then, there exists $\lambda_0\in\Lambda$ such that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_0}$.*

Proof. Since U is quasi-compact, we can choose a finite affine cover $U_i = Spec(A_i)$, $1\leq i\leq m$ of U. Then, for each $1\leq i\leq m$, we can express $\mathcal{N}(U_i)$ as a filtered colimit $\mathcal{N}(U_i)\cong\varinjlim_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\mathcal{N}_\lambda(U_i)$ of submodules. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is finitely generated, there exists $\lambda_i\in\Lambda$ such that the identity map $\mathcal{N}(U)\longrightarrow\mathcal{N}(U)$ factors through the monomorphism $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_i}(U_i)\longrightarrow\mathcal{N}(U_i)$. Hence, $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_i}(U_i)\longrightarrow\mathcal{N}(U_i)$ is also an epimorphism. It follows that $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_i}(U_i)\cong\mathcal{N}(U_i)$ (since it is both an epimorphism and a monomorphism and $A_i - Mod$ is an abelian category). Since U_i is affine, we now know that $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_i}|U_i = \mathcal{N}|U_i$.

Finally, since Λ is filtered and we have only finitely many U_i, it follows that we can choose $\lambda_0\in\Lambda$ such that $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_0}|U_i = \mathcal{N}|U_i$ for all $1\leq i\leq m$. Since the U_i form an affine cover of U, it now follows that $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{N}$.

□

Proposition 3.6. *Let $A\in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ be a commutative monoid object and let $X = Spec(A)$ be the affine scheme corresponding to A. Let U be a quasi-compact scheme over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ along with a Zariski open immersion $i: U\longrightarrow X$ that is also quasi-compact. Then, for any quasi-coherent sheaf $\mathcal{M}$ on X and a finitely generated quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{N}$ of the restriction $i^*\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}|_U$, there exists a finitely generated quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{N}'$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{N}'|_U = \mathcal{N}$.*

Proof. Since X is affine and hence semi-separated, it is clear that the open immersion i is semi-separated. Now, since i_* is a right adjoint, it follows that $i_*\mathcal{N}$ is a quasi-coherent submodule of $i_*i^*\mathcal{M} = i_*(\mathcal{M}|_U)$. We now set:

$$\overline{\mathcal{N}}(V) := lim(\mathcal{M}(V)\longrightarrow(i_*i^*\mathcal{M})(V)\longleftarrow i_*\mathcal{N}(V)) \qquad \forall\ V\in ZarAff(X) \tag{3.7}$$

Since $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ is defined in terms of a finite limit in (3.7), it follows that $\overline{\mathcal{N}}\in QCoh(X)$. Further, since $i_*\mathcal{N}\longrightarrow i_*i^*\mathcal{M}$ is a monomorphism, it follows from the limit in (3.7) that $\overline{\mathcal{N}}(V)\longrightarrow\mathcal{M}(V)$ is a monomorphism, i.e., $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ is a quasi-coherent submodule of $\mathcal{M}$. We now consider the restriction $\overline{\mathcal{N}}|_U$. For any $W\in ZarAff(U)$, it follows from (3.7) that:

$$(\overline{\mathcal{N}}|_U)(W) = \overline{\mathcal{N}}(W) = lim(\mathcal{M}(W)\longrightarrow(i_*i^*\mathcal{M})(W)\longleftarrow i_*\mathcal{N}(W)) \tag{3.8}$$

Since $W \in ZarAff(U)$, we notice that $\mathcal{M}(W) = i^*\mathcal{M}(W)$, $(i_*i^*\mathcal{M})(W) = ((i^*i_*)(i^*\mathcal{M}))(W)$and $i_*\mathcal{N}(W) = (i^*i_*\mathcal{N})(W)$. Then, it follows from Proposition 2.5 that $(i_*i^*\mathcal{M})(W) = i^*\mathcal{M}(W)$ and $i_*\mathcal{N}(W) = \mathcal{N}(W)$. Combining this with (3.8), it follows that

$$(\overline{\mathcal{N}}|_U)(W) = lim(i^*\mathcal{M}(W) \longrightarrow i^*\mathcal{M}(W) \longleftarrow \mathcal{N}(W)) = \mathcal{N}(W) \qquad \forall\ W \in ZarAff(U) \tag{3.9}$$

Thus, $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ is a quasi-coherent submodule of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{N}}|_U = \mathcal{N}$. Further, since $X = Spec(A)$ is affine, we know that $\overline{\mathcal{N}} \in QCoh(X)$ corresponds to an A-module $\overline{N}$. Using Proposition 3.2(a) and condition (C1) towards the beginning of this section, it follows that the A-module $\overline{N}$ may be expressed as a filtered colimit of its finitely generated submodules. Accordingly, we can express $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ as a filtered colimt $\overline{\mathcal{N}} = \varinjlim_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{N}_\lambda$, where $\mathcal{N}_\lambda$ is the quasi-coherent submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ corresponding to a finitely generated submodule N_λ of $\overline{N}$. From Lemma 3.3(a), it follows that the quasi-coherent module $\mathcal{N}_\lambda$ on $Spec(A)$ corresponding to a finitely generated submodule module N_λ of $\overline{N}$ is also finitely generated as a quasi-coherent sheaf on $X = Spec(A)$. Since the restriction i^* is a left adjoint, it now follows that:

$$\mathcal{N} = \overline{\mathcal{N}}|_U = \varinjlim_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{N}_\lambda|_U \tag{3.10}$$

As noted before, the system Λ is filtered. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is finitely generated, it now follows from Lemma 3.5 that there exists some $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$ such that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_0}|U$. This proves the result.

□

Let X be a quasi-compact scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and let $\{U_i\}_{1\leq i\leq n}$ be a finite affine cover of X. Then, we know that the scheme X can actually be written as a quotient Y/R, where $Y = \coprod_{i=1}^n U_i$ is the disjoint union of the affine schemes U_i and $R \subseteq Y \times Y$ is an equivalence relation in $Sh(Aff_{\mathcal{C}})$ satisfying certain conditions described in [35, Proposition 2.18]. We now recall the following construction from [4, § 4]: For any $1 \leq m \leq n$, we set $Y_m := \coprod_{i=1}^m U_i$ and consider the equivalence relation R_m on Y_m defined as follows:

$$\begin{tikzcd} R_m := R \times_{(Y\times Y)} (Y_m \times Y_m) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y_m \times Y_m \arrow[d] \\ R \arrow[r] & Y \times Y \end{tikzcd} \tag{3.11}$$

Then, we have shown in [4, Lemme 4.3] the following result:

Proposition 3.7. *For any given $1 \leq m \leq n$, consider the disjoint union $Y_m = \coprod_{i=1}^m U_i$ as well as the equivalence relation R_m as defined in* (3.11) *above. Then, the induced morphism $p_m : X_m \longrightarrow X$ from the scheme $X_m := Y_m/R_m$ is a Zariski open immersion.*

We note that the result of Proposition 3.6 applies in particular to open immersions $U = Spec(B) \longrightarrow X = Spec(A)$ of affine schemes. We will now extend this to the case where X is any quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and $U \in ZarAff(X)$.

Proposition 3.8. *Let X be a quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and let $U \in ZarAff(X)$. Then, for any quasi-coherent sheaf $\mathcal{M}$ on X and any finitely generated quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{N}$ of the restriction $\mathcal{M}|_U$, there exists a finitely generated quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{N}'$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{N}'|_U = \mathcal{N}$.*

Proof. Since X is quasi-compact, we can choose a finite affine cover $\{U_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ of X with $U_1 = U$. For any $1 \leq m \leq n$, we consider the schemes X_m and the open immersions $p_m : X_m \longrightarrow X$ as described above. We set $\mathcal{N}_1 = \mathcal{N}$. For every such m, we want to define a finitely generated quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{N}_m$ of $\mathcal{M}|_{X_m}$ such that $\mathcal{N}_m|_{X_i} = \mathcal{N}_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Suppose that we have successfully defined such sheaves $\mathcal{N}_i$ for every $i < m$. We will now describe how they can be used to define $\mathcal{N}_m$ on X_m.

We now choose some $W \in ZarAff(U_m)$ and consider the following fiber squares:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
U_i \times_X W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (X_{m-1} \times_X U_m) \times_X W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & W \arrow[d] \\
U_i \times_X U_m \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X_{m-1} \times_X U_m \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U_m \arrow[d] \\
U_i \arrow[r] & X_{m-1} \arrow[r, "p_{m-1}"] & X
\end{tikzcd} \quad \forall\ 1 \leq i < m \tag{3.12}$$

From Proposition 3.7, we know that $p_{m-1} : X_{m-1} \longrightarrow X$ is a Zariski open immersion and hence so is $(X_{m-1} \times_X U_m) \longrightarrow U_m$. Since X is semi-separated, $U_i \times_X W$ is affine for each $1 \leq i < m$. From (3.12), it follows that for any $W \in ZarAff(U_m)$, the fiber product $(X_{m-1} \times_X U_m) \times_X W$ has a finite affine covering $\{U_i \times_X W\}_{1 \leq i < m}$ and is therefore quasi-compact. It follows that the Zariski open immersion $(X_{m-1} \times_X U_m) \longrightarrow U_m$ is quasi-compact. In particular, since U_m is affine, i.e., $U_m \in ZarAff(U_m)$, it also follows that $(X_{m-1} \times_X U_m)$ is quasi-compact. We can now apply Proposition 3.6 to the immersion $(X_{m-1} \times_X U_m) \longrightarrow U_m$.

Accordingly, it follows that there exists a finitely generated quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{N}'_m$ of $\mathcal{M}|_{U_m}$ such that:

$$\mathcal{N}'_m|_{(X_{m-1} \times_X U_m)} = \mathcal{N}_{m-1}|_{(X_{m-1} \times_X U_m)} \tag{3.13}$$

From (3.13), it follows that the quasi-coherent sheaves $\mathcal{N}_{m-1}$ and $\mathcal{N}'_m$ on X_{m-1} and U_m respectively agree on $X_{m-1} \times_X U_m$. Hence, we can consider the quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{N}_m$ of $\mathcal{M}|_{X_m}$ such that $\mathcal{N}_m|_{X_{m-1}} = \mathcal{N}_{m-1}$ and $\mathcal{N}_m|_{U_m} = \mathcal{N}'_m$. Further, the restriction of $\mathcal{N}_m$ to X_{m-1} and U_m being finitely generated, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $\mathcal{N}_m$ is a finitely generated quasi-coherent sheaf on X_m.

It follows that $\mathcal{N}' := \mathcal{N}_n$ is a finitely generated quasi-coherent submodule of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{N}'|_U = \mathcal{N}$. □

We are now ready to show that any quasi-coherent sheaf on a quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme is a filtered direct limit of its finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules.

Theorem 3.9. *Let X be a quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a quasi-coherent sheaf on X. Then, $\mathcal{M}$ can be expressed as a filtered direct limit of its finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules.*

Proof. We consider the system $\{\mathcal{M}_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda_M}$ of finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules of $\mathcal{M}$. From Proposition 3.2(b), we know that Λ_M is filtered. We have a natural morphism:

$$f : \mathcal{M}' := \varinjlim_{\lambda \in \Lambda_M} \mathcal{M}_\lambda \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \qquad \mathcal{M}'(U) := \varinjlim_{\lambda \in \Lambda_M} \mathcal{M}_\lambda(U) \qquad \forall\ U \in ZarAff(X) \tag{3.14}$$

Since each $\mathcal{M}_\lambda(U) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(U)$ is a monomorphism, $f(U) : \mathcal{M}'(U) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(U)$ is also a monomorphism (because filtered colimits commute with finite limits in $\mathcal{O}_X(U)-Mod$). Hence, $f : \mathcal{M}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a monomorphism in $QCoh(X)$.

We now consider the restriction $\mathcal{M}|_U$ of $\mathcal{M}$ to some $U \in ZarAff(X)$. Since U is affine, we can express $\mathcal{M}|_U$ as a filtered colimit of its finitely generated submodules $\mathcal{M}'_\lambda$, $\lambda \in \Lambda_U$. From Proposition 3.8, it follows that we can choose finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules $\mathcal{M}''_\lambda$, $\lambda \in \Lambda_U$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{M}''_\lambda|_U = \mathcal{M}'_\lambda$. We let Λ'_M be the filtered subsystem of Λ_M consisting of all finite sums of the finitely generated submodules $\{\mathcal{M}''_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda_U, U \in ZarAff(X)}$. Then, it is clear that the natural morphism:

$$g : \mathcal{M}'' := \varinjlim_{\lambda \in \Lambda'_M} \mathcal{M}''_\lambda \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \tag{3.15}$$

is an isomorphism. Further, the isomorphism $g : \mathcal{M}'' \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{M}$ factors through $f : \mathcal{M}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ from which it follows that f is also an epimorphism in $QCoh(X)$. Since $QCoh(X)$ is an abelian category (see [4, Proposition 2.9]), it follows that f is an isomorphism.

□

4 Noetherian commutative monoids and field objects over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$

In this section, we will introduce and study Noetherian schemes and field objects over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. We will define Noetherian commutative monoids to be those for which every finitely generated module is also "finitely presented" (see Definition 4.1). Our notion of a "field object" in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ is presented in Definition 4.4. We will see that with the notion of field object as in Definition 4.4, we can recover several of the usual properties of a field. Thereafter, in Section 5, we will show how the points of a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme X over a field object K can be recovered from certain kinds of cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functors between categories of quasi-coherent sheaves.

Definition 4.1. *Let $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ be a commutative monoid object of $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. For any $n \geq 1$, we let A^n denote the direct sum of n-copies of A. We will say that A is Noetherian if for any finitely generated A-module M, there exists a morphism $q : A^m \longrightarrow A^n$ for some m, $n \geq 1$ such that M can be expressed as a colimit:*

$$colim(0 \longleftarrow A^m \xrightarrow{q} A^n) \xrightarrow{\cong} M \tag{4.1}$$

We will say that a scheme X over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ is Noetherian if for any affine $U = Spec(A) \in ZarAff(X)$, A is a Noetherian commutative monoid object in the above sense.

We note here that in previous work in [3], we have explored other notions of "Noetherian" for monoids objects and schemes over symmetric monoidal categories. Before we proceed further, we must show that if $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ is Noetherian, the corresponding affine scheme $Spec(A)$ is a Noetherian scheme in the sense of Definition 4.1. In order to prove this, we mention here the following Lemma that is well known in the case of ordinary commutative rings (see, for example, [21, Chapitre IV]).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f : A \longrightarrow B$ be an epimorphism of commutative monoid objects in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Then, we have an isomorphism $B \cong B \otimes_A B$.*

Proof. Let f_1, $f_2 : B \longrightarrow C$ be morphisms in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ satisfying $f_1 \circ f = f_2 \circ f$. Then, f being an epimorphism in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$, we must have $f_1 = f_2$. In other words, B is the pushout in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ of the diagram $B \xleftarrow{f} A \xrightarrow{f} B$. On the other hand, we know that the pushout of $B \xleftarrow{f} A \xrightarrow{f} B$ is $B \otimes_A B$. It follows that $B \cong B \otimes_A B$.

□

Proposition 4.3. *Let $f : A \longrightarrow B$ be an epimorphism of commutative monoids in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ such that B is a flat A-module. Then, if $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ is Noetherian, so is B. In particular, if $A \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ is a Noetherian commutative monoid object, $Spec(A)$ is a Noetherian scheme.*

Proof. Let A be Noetherian and let N be a finitely generated B-module. Then, N is an A-module by "restriction of scalars". From condition (C1) in Section 3, we know that as an A-module, N may be expressed as the filtered colimit of its finitely generated A-submodules $\{N_i\}_{i \in I}$. It follows that:

$$N \otimes_A B \cong \varinjlim_{i \in I} N_i \otimes_A B \tag{4.2}$$

On the other hand, since $f : A \longrightarrow B$ is an epimorphism in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$, we know from Lemma 4.2 that $B \otimes_A B \cong B$. Combining this with (4.2), we have:

$$N \cong N \otimes_B B \cong N \otimes_B (B \otimes_A B) \cong N \otimes_A B \cong \varinjlim_{i \in I} N_i \otimes_A B \tag{4.3}$$

Since B is a flat A-module, $\{N_i \otimes_A B\}_{i \in I}$ is a filtered system of monomorphisms in $B - Mod$. Then, N being a finitely generated B-module, there exists $i_0 \in I$ such that $N \cong N_{i_0} \otimes_A B$.

Finally, since A is Noetherian and N_{i_0} is finitely generated as an A-module, there exists a morphism $q : A^m \longrightarrow A^n$ for some $m, n \geq 1$ such that N_{i_0} can be expressed as a colimit:

$$colim(0 \longleftarrow A^m \xrightarrow{q} A^n) \xrightarrow{\cong} N_{i_0} \tag{4.4}$$

From (4.4), it follows that:

$$N \cong N_{i_0} \otimes_A B \cong colim(0 \longleftarrow A^m \xrightarrow{q} A^n) \otimes_A B \cong colim\left(0 \longleftarrow B^m \xrightarrow{q \otimes_A B} B^n\right) \tag{4.5}$$

Hence, B is Noetherian.

In particular, if $f : A \longrightarrow B$ induces a Zariski open immersion of affine schemes, we know that $f : A \longrightarrow B$ must be an epimorphism in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ (see [35, Définition 2.9]) and B must be a flat A-module. Hence, $Spec(A)$ is Noetherian.

□

Definition 4.4. *Let $K \in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ be a commutative monoid object of $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ such that $K \neq 0$. We will say that K is a field object of $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ if K is Noetherian and any monomorphism $I \longrightarrow K$ in $K - Mod$ is either an isomorphism or zero.*

Since K is a commutative monoid object, it follows from the well known "Eckmann-Hilton argument" (see [12]) that $\mathcal{E}(K) := Hom_{K-Mod}(K,K)$ is a commutative ring. In particular, since the field object K has no subobjects in $K-Mod$ (other than 0 and K), every non-zero morphism in $Hom_{K-Mod}(K,K)$ is an isomorphism. It follows that for a field object K in $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$, $\mathcal{E}(K)$ is a field. Further, for any K-module M, $Hom_{K-Mod}(K,M)$ becomes a vector space over $\mathcal{E}(K)$. In the rest of this section, we will further study field objects in $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let K be a field object in $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ and let $f : L \longrightarrow K$ be an epimorphism in $K-Mod$. Then, the induced map $Hom_{K-Mod}(K,f) : Hom_{K-Mod}(K,L) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K,K)$ is a surjection.*

Proof. For any $M \in K-Mod$, let $f_M : Hom_{K-Mod}(M,L) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(M,K)$ denote the morphism induced by f. Now, since $\mathcal{E}(K) = Hom_{K-Mod}(K,K)$ is a field, if we assume that $f_K : Hom_{K-Mod}(K,L) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K,K)$ is not a surjection of vector spaces, it must be 0. Then, for any $n \geq 1$, the morphism $f_{K^n} : Hom_{K-Mod}(K^n,L) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K^n,K)$ induced by f is 0. Further, since K is Noetherian, any finitely generated K-module M can be expressed as a colimit of the form: $M \cong colim(0 \longleftarrow K^m \xrightarrow{q} K^n)$. We now have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
lim(0 \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K^m,L) \longleftarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K^n,L)) \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[d, "0"'] & Hom_{K-Mod}(M,L) \arrow[d, "f_M"'] \\
lim(0 \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K^m,K) \longleftarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K^n,K)) \arrow[r, "\cong"] & Hom_{K-Mod}(M,K)
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.6}$$

We see that $f_M = 0 : Hom_{K-Mod}(M,L) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(M,K)$ for any finitely generated K-module M. Finally, since every K-module can be expressed as a filtered colimit of its finitely generated submodules, it follows that $f_M = 0$ for each $M \in K-Mod$. From Yoneda Lemma, it now follows that $f = 0 : L \longrightarrow K$. Since $K \neq 0$, this contradicts the fact that f is an epimorphism. □

Proposition 4.6. *Let K be a field object in $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$. Then:*

(a) For any $n \geq 1$, K^n is a projective object of $K-Mod$.

(b) Let $f : M \longrightarrow N$ be a morphism of finitely generated K-modules. Choose any morphisms $q_M : K^{m'} \longrightarrow K^m$ and $q_N : K^{n'} \longrightarrow K^n$ such that M and N may be expressed as

$$M \cong colim(0 \longleftarrow K^{m'} \xrightarrow{q_M} K^m) \qquad N \cong colim(0 \longleftarrow K^{n'} \xrightarrow{q_N} K^n) \tag{4.7}$$

respectively. Then, we have morphisms $g : K^m \longrightarrow K^n$ and $h : K^{m'} \longrightarrow K^{n'}$ such that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K^{m'} \arrow[r, "q_M"] \arrow[d, "h"'] & K^m \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "g"'] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"'] & 0 \\
K^{n'} \arrow[r, "q_N"] & K^n \arrow[r] & N \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.8}$$

Proof. (a) It suffices to show that K is projective. Let $p : S \longrightarrow T$ be an epimorphism in $K - Mod$ and take any $f \in Hom_{K-Mod}(K,T)$. Set $T' := Im(f)$. We now define a pullback square:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
S' \arrow[r, "p'"] \arrow[d] & T' = Im(f) \arrow[d] \\
S \arrow[r, "p"] & T
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.9}$$

Since $K - Mod$ is an abelian category and $p : S \longrightarrow T$ is an epimorphism, its pullback $p' : S' \longrightarrow T'$ is also an epimorphism (see, for example, [14, § 2.54]). Now, if $T' = 0$, the morphism $f = 0 : K \longrightarrow T$ lifts to S. Otherwise, since K has no subobjects other than 0 and K, we must have $T' \cong K$. It now follows from Lemma 4.5 that the morphism $Hom_{K-Mod}(K,S') \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K,T') \cong Hom_{K-Mod}(K,K)$ induced by $p' : S' \longrightarrow T' \cong K$ must be an epimorphism. Therefore, the morphism $f : K \longrightarrow T' = Im(f)$ can be lifted to a morphism from K to S'. Composing with the inclusion $S' \hookrightarrow S$, we see that the morphism $f : K \longrightarrow Im(f) = T' \hookrightarrow T$ can be lifted to a morphism from K to S. Hence K is projective.

(b) The horizontal rows of the diagram (4.8) are exact in $K - Mod$. Since K is projective, the proof of part (b) follows exactly as in the usual case of finitely presented modules over a commutative ring.

□

Lemma 4.7. *Every monomorphism (resp. epimorphism) in $K - Mod$ is a split monomorphism (resp. a split epimorphism).*

Proof. Let $i : M \longrightarrow N$ be a monomorphism in $K - Mod$. Then, $i_K := Hom_{K-Mod}(K,i) : Hom_{K-Mod}(K,M) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K,N)$ is a monomorphism of vector spaces. Hence, there exists a morphism $p_K : Hom_{K-Mod}(K,N) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K,M)$ such that $p_K \circ i_K = 1$. Since K is Noetherian, any finitely generated module F in $K - Mod$ can be expressed as a colimit $F \cong colim(0 \longleftarrow K^m \longrightarrow K^n)$. Then, since

$$\begin{array}{c} lim(0 \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K^m,M) \longleftarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K^n,M)) \cong Hom_{K-Mod}(F,M) \\ lim(0 \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K^m,N) \longleftarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K^n,N)) \cong Hom_{K-Mod}(F,N) \end{array} \tag{4.10}$$

the morphisms i_K and p_K induce:

$$Hom_{K-Mod}(F,M) \xrightarrow{i_F} Hom_{K-Mod}(F,N) \xrightarrow{p_F} Hom_{K-Mod}(F,M) \qquad p_F \circ i_F = 1 \tag{4.11}$$

From Proposition 4.6(b), we see that the morphism p_F does not depend on the choice of the presentation $F \cong colim(0 \longleftarrow K^m \longrightarrow K^n)$. Further, since any module in $K - Mod$ can be expressed as a colimit of its finitely generated submodules, we have morphisms p_F and i_F as in (4.11) for any $F \in K - Mod$. From Yoneda lemma, it follows that the morphisms p_F are induced by a morphim $p : N \longrightarrow M$ with $p \circ i = 1$. Hence, every monomorphism in $K - Mod$ splits. Further, since every epimorphism in $K - Mod$ can be fitted into a short exact sequence, it follows that every epimorphism in $K - Mod$ also splits. □

Proposition 4.8. *Let K be a field object in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Then, every finitely generated K-module is isomorphic to a direct sum K^m for some $m \geq 1$.*

Proof. Since K is Noetherian, for every finitely generated module M, there exists an epimorphism $K^n \longrightarrow M$ for some $n \geq 1$ as in (4.1). By Lemma 4.7, the epimorphism splits and hence there is an inclusion $M \hookrightarrow K^n$. Accordingly, $Hom_{K-Mod}(K, M)$ is a subspace of the finite dimensional vector space $Hom_{K-Mod}(K, K^n) = \mathcal{E}(K)^n$. Hence, we have an isomorphism $i_K : Hom_{K-Mod}(K, M) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{E}(K)^m = Hom_{K-Mod}(K, K^m)$ for some $m \leq n$.

Then, by expressing any finitely generated K-module F as a colimit $F \cong colim(0 \longleftarrow K^p \longrightarrow K^q)$, we see that i_K induces a morphism $i_F : Hom_{K-Mod}(F, M) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(F, K^m)$ for each finitely generated F in $K - Mod$. Again, from Proposition 4.6(b), it follows that i_F is independent of the choice of the presentation $F \cong colim(0 \longleftarrow K^p \longrightarrow K^q)$. Further, since any module in $K - Mod$ can be expressed as a colimit of its finitely generated submodules, we have a morphism $i_F : Hom_{K-Mod}(F, M) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(F, K^m)$ for any $F \in K - Mod$. Since i_K is an isomorphism, so is each i_F. From Yoneda lemma, it now follows that the isomorphisms i_F are induced by an isomorphism $i : M \xrightarrow{\cong} K^m$. □

We also record here the following result that will be useful to us in Section 5.

Proposition 4.9. *Let K be a field object in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Then, if $i : U \longrightarrow Spec(K)$ is a Zariski open immersion, then either $U = Spec(0)$ or $U = Spec(K)$ and i is an isomorphism.*

Proof. First, we suppose that U is affine. Let $U = Spec(A)$ and suppose that $A \neq 0$. Since K has no proper subobjects, the induced morphism $K \longrightarrow A$ must be a monomorphism in $K - Mod$. Therefore, we can consider the short exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow A/K \longrightarrow 0$ in $K - Mod$. Further, since $Spec(A) \longrightarrow Spec(K)$ is a Zariski open immersion, A is a flat K-module. It follows that we have the following short exact sequence in $K - Mod$:

$$0 \longrightarrow A \otimes_K K \cong A \longrightarrow A \otimes_K A \longrightarrow A \otimes_K (A/K) \longrightarrow 0 \tag{4.12}$$

Again, $K \longrightarrow A$ being an epimorphism in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$, it follows from Lemma 4.2 that $A \otimes_K K \cong A \cong A \otimes_K A$. Hence, $A \otimes_K (A/K) = 0$. Using Lemma 4.7, the monomorphism $K \longrightarrow A$ in $K - Mod$ splits and we can write $A \cong K \oplus K'$ for some $K' \in K - Mod$. Then:

$$(K \oplus K') \otimes_K K' \cong A \otimes_K (A/K) = 0 \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad 0 = K \otimes_K K' \cong K' \tag{4.13}$$

Hence, $A \cong K$ and i is an isomorphism.

In general, we consider a Zariski open immersion $i : U \longrightarrow Spec(K)$. If $U = Spec(0)$, we are already done. Otherwise, we can choose $V \in ZarAff(U)$ such that $V = Spec(A)$ with $A \neq 0$. From the above, it follows that $V \longrightarrow U \longrightarrow Spec(K)$ is an isomorphism. Then, the following pullback square

$$\begin{tikzcd} V \cong U \times_U V \cong U \times_{Spec(K)} V \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & V \cong Spec(K) \arrow[d, "\cong"'] \\ U \arrow[r, "i"] & Spec(K) \end{tikzcd} \tag{4.14}$$

shows that $V \longrightarrow U$ is an isomorphism. This proves the result.

□

We now come to the construction of field objects in $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$. In general, for a commutative monoid $A\in Comm(\mathcal{C})$, we let $\mathcal{E}(A)$ be the commutative ring $\mathcal{E}(A):=Hom_{A-Mod}(A,A)$. Further, any morphism $f:A\longrightarrow B$ in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ induces a morphism $\mathcal{E}(f):\mathcal{E}(A)\longrightarrow\mathcal{E}(B)$ of commutative rings. When $\mathcal{E}(A)$ is an integral domain and A is Noetherian, we will now localize A with respect to the non-zero elements of $\mathcal{E}(A)$ (in the sense of [2]) to obtain a field object $K(A)$. This is an analogue of the construction of the quotient field of an ordinary integral domain.

More precisely, for any $0\neq s\in\mathcal{E}(A)$, consider the localization A_s of A with respect to s as in [2, (3.1)]:

$$A_s:=colim(A\xrightarrow{s}A\xrightarrow{s}A\xrightarrow{s}\dots)\tag{4.15}$$

Further, by considering the morphisms $A_s\longrightarrow A_{st}$ for any s, $t\in\mathcal{E}(A)\backslash\{0\}$, we define $K(A)$ to be the colimit (see [2, (3.3)]):

$$K(A):=\underset{s\in\mathcal{E}(A)\backslash\{0\}}{colim}\ A_s\tag{4.16}$$

Proposition 4.10. *Let $A\in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ be a Noetherian commutative monoid object such that $\mathcal{E}(A)$ is an integral domain. Let $K(A)$ be as defined in* (4.16)*. Then, $K(A)$ is a Noetherian monoid.*

Proof. In [2, Proposition 3.2-3.3], it is already shown that the localization $K(A)$ is a commutative monoid along with a morphism $i:A\longrightarrow K(A)$ in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ making $K(A)$ into a flat A-module.

We want to show that $i:A\longrightarrow K(A)$ is also an epimorphism in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$. For this, we consider morphisms $f,g:K(A)\longrightarrow B$ in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ with $h:=f\circ i=g\circ i:A\longrightarrow B$. Then, we have $\mathcal{E}(h)=\mathcal{E}(f)\circ\mathcal{E}(i)=\mathcal{E}(g)\circ\mathcal{E}(i)$. Now, for any $s\in\mathcal{E}(A)\backslash\{0\}$, $\mathcal{E}(i)(s)$ is a unit in $\mathcal{E}(K(A))$. Hence, $\mathcal{E}(h)(s)$ is a unit in $\mathcal{E}(B)$. Then, from [2, § 3], it follows that there exists a unique morphism $j:K(A)\longrightarrow B$ in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ from the localization $K(A)$ such that $h=j\circ i$. Consequently, we have $f=j=g$.

Now since $i:A\longrightarrow K(A)$ is a flat epimorphism of commutative monoids and A is Noetherian, it follows from Proposition 4.3 that $K(A)$ is Noetherian. ☐

Proposition 4.11. *Let $A\in Comm(\mathcal{C})$ be a Noetherian commutative monoid object such that $\mathcal{E}(A)$ is an integral domain. Let $K(A)$ be as defined in* (4.16)*. Then, if A is a finitely generated A-module, then $K(A)$ is a field object in $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$.*

Proof. We have already checked that $K(A)$ is Noetherian. We will first show that $K(A)\neq 0$. We set $K:=K(A)$ and $S:=\mathcal{E}(A)\backslash\{0\}$. We choose some $s\in S$ and let $i:I\longrightarrow A$ be the kernel of $s:A\longrightarrow A$. Then, if we consider any $f\in Hom_{A-Mod}(A,I)$, we see that $s\circ(i\circ f)=0$. Since $\mathcal{E}(A)$ is an integral domain and $s\neq 0$, it follows that $i\circ f=0$. Further, since i is a monomorphism, it follows that $f=0$. Therefore, we see that $Hom_{A-Mod}(A,I)=0$. Since A is Noetherian, it now follows as in the proof of Lemma 4.7 that $I=0$. Hence $s:A\longrightarrow A$ is a monomorphism for any $s\in S$. Now, considering the filtered colimits appearing in (4.15) and (4.16), it is clear that we have a monomorphism $A\longrightarrow K=K(A)$. Hence, $K(A)\neq 0$.

Since any $0\neq s:A\longrightarrow A$ is a monomorphism and A is finitely generated, it follows from the filtered colimit of monomorphisms defining A_s in (4.15) that $\mathcal{E}(A_s)=Hom_{A_s-Mod}(A_s,A_s)\cong Hom_{A-Mod}(A,A_s)=\mathcal{E}(A)_s$. For any $0\neq t\in\mathcal{E}(A)$, the monomorphism $t:A\longrightarrow A$ induces a monomorphism $t : A_s \longrightarrow A_s$ of filtered colimits. Now the same reasoning as in the previous paragraph shows that for any $0 \neq s, t \in \mathcal{E}(A)$, the morphism $t : A_s \longrightarrow A_{st}$ is a monomorphism. Then, since A is finitely generated, considering the filtered colimit of monomorphisms defining $K(A)$ in (4.16), we have $\mathcal{E}(K(A)) = Hom_{K(A)-Mod}(K(A), K(A)) \cong Hom_{A-Mod}(A, K(A)) = Q(\mathcal{E}(A))$ where $Q(\mathcal{E}(A))$ denotes the field of fractions of the integral domain $\mathcal{E}(A)$.

On the other hand, let $i' : I' \longrightarrow K = K(A)$ be a monomorphism in $K - Mod$. Then, the induced map $i'_K : Hom_{K-Mod}(K, I') \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K, K) = \mathcal{E}(K)$ is a monomorphism of vector spaces over the field $\mathcal{E}(K) = Q(\mathcal{E}(A))$. Hence, i'_K is either 0 or an isomorphism. If $i'_K : Hom_{K-Mod}(K, I') \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K, K)$ is an isomorphism, it follows as in the proof of Proposition 4.8 that $i' : I' \longrightarrow K$ is an isomorphism. On the other hand, if $i'_K = 0$, it follows similarly that $I' = 0$.

□

5 Points of a Noetherian scheme over a field object

For an ordinary scheme Z in usual algebraic geometry over $Spec(R)$, where R is a ring, the points of Z over a field K are the morphisms $Spec(K) \longrightarrow Z$. Given a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme X over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$, we will consider in this section the points of X over a field object K in $\mathcal{C}$. Accordingly, a point of X over K corresponds to a morphism $Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$ and therefore a pullback functor $QCoh(X) \longrightarrow QCoh(Spec(K)) = K - Mod$. In this section, we want to find out which kinds of symmetric monoidal functors from $QCoh(X)$ to $K - Mod$ can be described as pullbacks by some morphism $Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$.

Let A and B be ordinary commutative rings and let $F : A - Mod \longrightarrow B - Mod$ be a cocontinuous strong tensor functor from the category of A-modules to the category of B-modules. Then, F induces a morphism $f : A = Hom_{A-Mod}(A, A) \longrightarrow Hom_{B-Mod}(B, B) = B$ of rings. Then, it may be verified easily that the functor F is given by "extension of scalars" along the morphism $f : A \longrightarrow B$. However, this argument does not extend directly to the case of commutative monoid objects A and B in a symmetric monoidal category. In fact, in order to study functors between module categories over commutative monoid objects in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$, we need the concept of "normal functors" from Vitale [37].

Definition 5.1. *(see [37, Definition 4.2]) Let A and B be commutative monoid objects in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. A normal functor $(F, \tau) : A - Mod \longrightarrow B - Mod$ consists of a functor $F : A - Mod \longrightarrow B - Mod$ along with a family of morphisms:*

$$\tau_{M,N} : \underline{Hom}_A(M, N) \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}_B(F(M), F(N)) \qquad \forall\ M, N \in A - Mod \tag{5.1}$$

in $\mathcal{C}$ satisfying the following three conditions:

(1) The family $\{\tau_{M,N}\}_{M,N \in A-Mod}$ is natural in M and N.

(2) The family $\{\tau_{M,N}\}_{M,N\in A-Mod}$ is compatible with internal composition, i.e., for M, N, $P \in A-Mod$, we have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\underline{Hom}_A(M,N) \otimes \underline{Hom}_A(N,P) \arrow[r, "\tau_{M,N}\otimes\tau_{N,P}"] \arrow[d, "\circ"'] & \underline{Hom}_B(F(M),F(N)) \otimes \underline{Hom}_B(F(N),F(P)) \arrow[d, "\circ"'] \\
\underline{Hom}_A(M,P) \arrow[r, "\tau_{M,P}"] & \underline{Hom}_B(F(M),F(P))
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.2}$$

Further, the family is also compatible with the identity $1 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}_A(M,M)$ of the monoid $\underline{Hom}_A(M,M)$ for any $M \in A-Mod$.

(3) For any $f : M \longrightarrow N$ in $A-Mod$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
1 \arrow[r, "1"] \arrow[d, "\widetilde{f}"'] & 1 \arrow[d, "\widetilde{F(f)}"'] \\
\underline{Hom}_A(M,N) \arrow[r, "\tau_{M,N}"] & \underline{Hom}_B(F(M),F(N))
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.3}$$

where $\widetilde{f} : 1 \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}_A(M,N)$ (resp. $\widetilde{F(f)} : 1 \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}_B(F(M),F(N))$) is the factorization of f (resp. $F(f)$) through $\underline{Hom}_A(M,N) \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}(M,N)$ (resp. $\underline{Hom}_B(F(M),F(N)) \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}(F(M),F(N))$).

Proposition 5.2. *Let A, B be commutative monoid objects in $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ and suppose that A is Noetherian. Let $(F,\tau) : A-Mod \longrightarrow B-Mod$ be a normal functor such that $F : A-Mod \longrightarrow B-Mod$ is a cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functor. Then, there is a morphism $f : A \longrightarrow B$ in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ such that $F(M) = B\otimes_A M$ for each $M \in B-Mod$.*

Proof. We set $f := \tau_{A,A} : A = \underline{Hom}_A(A,A) \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}_B(B,B) = B$. From the conditions in Definition 5.1, we see that f is a morphism in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$. Since F is a symmetric monoidal functor, we see that $F(A) = B = B\otimes_A A$. Now, if M is a finitely generated A-module, we can express M as a colimit $M = colim(0 \longleftarrow A^m \longrightarrow A^n)$. Then, since F is cocontinuous, we have:

$$F(M) = colim(0 \longleftarrow F(A^m) \longrightarrow F(A^n)) = colim(0 \longleftarrow B\otimes_A A^m \longrightarrow B\otimes_A A^n) = B\otimes_A M \tag{5.4}$$

Finally, since any module in $A-Mod$ can be expressed as a colimit of finitely generated submodules, it follows from (5.4) that $F(M) = B\otimes_A M$ for any $M \in A-Mod$. □

Let X be a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ and let K be a field object. The result of Proposition 5.2 suggests that morphisms $Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$ should correspond to "normal functors" from $QCoh(X)$ to $K-Mod$ that are also cocontinuous and symmetric monoidal. However, it is not immediately clear how we can define the notion of a "normal functor" from $QCoh(X)$ to $K-Mod$. In order to introduce this notion, we will make use of the following definition from [5], which explains what it means for a functor from $QCoh(X)$ to $K-Mod$ to be "local" with respect to some $U \in ZarAff(X)$.

Definition 5.3. *(see [5, Definition 2.3.5]) Let* $(C,\otimes,1_C)$*,* $(D,\otimes,1_D)$ *and* $(E,\otimes,1_E)$ *be preadditive symmetric monoidal categories. Let* (i^*,i_*) *be a pair of adjoint functors between* E *and* D*, with* $i^*:E\longrightarrow D$ *a symmetric monoidal functor and* $i_*:D\longrightarrow E$ *a lax tensor functor. Further, suppose that the counit* $\varepsilon:i^*i_*\longrightarrow id_D$ *is an isomorphism. Let* $\eta:id_E\longrightarrow i_*i^*$ *be the unit natural transformation. Then, a functor* $F:E\longrightarrow C$ *is said to be i-local if* $F\eta:F\longrightarrow Fi_*i^*$ *is an isomorphism.*

From Definition 5.3, it may be easily verified that we have an equivalence of categories:

$$Fun(D,C)\underset{\circ i_*}{\overset{\circ i^*}{\rightleftarrows}}\{F\in Fun(E,C),\ i\text{-local}\}\tag{5.5}$$

Here $Fun(D,C)$ (resp. $Fun(E,C)$) denotes the category of functors from D (resp. from E) to C. We will also need the following result from [5].

Proposition 5.4. *(see [5, Proposition 2.3.6]) In the setup of Definition 5.3, one has:*

(a) Let f *be any morphism in* E *such that* $i^*(f)$ *is an isomorphism in* D*. Then, a functor* $F:E\longrightarrow C$ *is i-local if and only if* $F(f)$ *is an isomorphism in* C *for every such morphism* f*.*

(b) Let $Fun_{c\otimes}(D,C)$ *(resp.* $Fun_{c\otimes}(E,C)$ *) be the category of all cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functors from* D *(resp.* E*) to* C*. Then, we have an equivalence of categories:*

$$Fun_{c\otimes}(D,C)\underset{\circ i_*}{\overset{\circ i^*}{\rightleftarrows}}\{F\in Fun_{c\otimes}(E,C),\ i\text{-}local\}\tag{5.6}$$

In particular, let X be a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$ and let $i:U\longrightarrow X$ be a Zariski open immersion with U affine. Then, as mentioned in Section 2, it follows that $i^*:QCoh(X)\longrightarrow QCoh(U)$ is a symmetric monoidal functor and $i_*:QCoh(U)\longrightarrow QCoh(X)$ is a lax tensor functor. Further, we know from Proposition 2.5 that the counit $i^*i_*\longrightarrow id_{QCoh(U)}$ is an isomorphism of functors. Therefore, in particular, we can set $D=QCoh(U)$ and $E=QCoh(X)$ in Definition 5.3. Further, given a commutative monoid object A in $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$, we can set $C=A-Mod$ in Definition 5.3. Accordingly, we will say that a functor $F:QCoh(X)\longrightarrow A-Mod$ is U-local if the natural transformation $F\longrightarrow F\circ i_*\circ i^*$ is an isomorphism. We are now ready to introduce normal functors from $QCoh(X)$ to $A-Mod$ for some $A\in Comm(\mathcal{C})$.

Definition 5.5. *Let* X *be a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over* $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$*. Let* A *be a commutative monoid object in* $\mathcal{C}$*. Then, we will say that a functor* $F:QCoh(X)\longrightarrow A-Mod$ *is normal if there exists a normal functor* $(G^U,\tau^U):B-Mod\longrightarrow A-Mod$ *with* $F\cong G^U\circ i^*$ *for each* $(i:U=Spec(B)\longrightarrow X)\in ZarAff(X)$ *such that* F *is i-local.*

We remark that the condition in Definition 5.5 could be satisfied vacuously, i.e., there might not exist $U\in ZarAff(X)$ such that F is U-local.

Let K be a field object in $(\mathcal{C},\otimes,1)$. We will now show that morphisms $Spec(K)\longrightarrow X$ correspond to cocontinuous symmetric monoidal normal functors from $QCoh(X)$ to $K-Mod$. For this, the first step is to show that given a cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functor $F:QCoh(X)\longrightarrow K-Mod$, there exists $U \in ZarAff(X)$ such that F is U-local. The latter is an analogue of the result of Brandenburg and Chirvasitu [5, Lemma 3.3.6] in the case of usual schemes.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a quasi-coherent sheaf on X and let $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{N}'$ be quasi-coherent submodules of $\mathcal{M}$. For any $U \in ZarAff(X)$, consider the morphism:

$$\mathcal{O}_X(U) \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}(\mathcal{N}(U), (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(U)) \tag{5.7}$$

that corresponds, by adjointness, to the composition $\mathcal{O}_X(U)\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}\mathcal{N}(U) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(U) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(U)$ in $\mathcal{O}_X(U) - Mod$. We set:

$$U \mapsto (\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})(U) := Ker(\mathcal{O}_X(U) \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}(\mathcal{N}(U), (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(U))) \tag{5.8}$$

Proposition 5.6. *Let X be a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a quasi-coherent sheaf on X and let $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{N}'$ be quasi-coherent submodules of $\mathcal{M}$. Let $[\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N}]$ be the set of all quasi-coherent submodules $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$ such that the composed morphism:*

$$\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \tag{5.9}$$

factors through $\mathcal{N}'$. Then, if $\mathcal{N}$ is finitely generated, we have:

(a) The association $U \mapsto (\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})(U)$ for all $U \in ZarAff(X)$ defines a quasi-coherent submodule of $\mathcal{O}_X$.

(b) The quasi-coherent submodule $(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})$ equals the sum of all the submodules $\mathcal{I} \in [\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N}]$.

Proof. (a) Let $U \in ZarAff(X)$ and let $V \in ZarAff(U)$. We need to show that $(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})(V) \cong (\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})(U) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} \mathcal{O}_X(V)$. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is finitely generated and X is Noetherian, it follows from Definition 4.1 that there exists a morphism $\mathcal{O}_X(U)^m \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U)^n$ such that:

$$\begin{gathered} \mathcal{N}(U) = colim(0 \longleftarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U)^m \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U)^n) \\ \mathcal{N}(V) \cong \mathcal{N}(U) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} \mathcal{O}_X(V) = colim(0 \longleftarrow \mathcal{O}_X(V)^m \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(V)^n) \end{gathered} \tag{5.10}$$

From (5.10), it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\underline{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}(\mathcal{N}(U), (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(U))) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} \mathcal{O}_X(V) \\ &\cong lim(0 \longrightarrow (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(U))^m \longleftarrow (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(U))^n) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} \mathcal{O}_X(V) \\ &\cong lim(0 \longrightarrow (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(V))^m \longleftarrow (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(V))^n) \\ &\cong \underline{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)}(\mathcal{N}(V), (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(V))) \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Now, since the kernel defining $(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})(U)$ in (5.8) is a finite limit, it follows from (5.11) that we have $(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})(V) \cong (\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})(U) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} \mathcal{O}_X(V)$.

(b) From part (a), we know that $(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})$ is a quasi-coherent submodule of $\mathcal{O}_X$. For a quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$, the morphism in (5.9) factors through $\mathcal{N}'$ if and only if the composition $\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}'$ is 0. Then, using adjointness, it follows that $\mathcal{I} \in [\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N}]$ if and only for each $U \in ZarAff(X)$, the composition $\mathcal{I}(U) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U) \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}(\mathcal{N}(U), (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(U))$ is 0. By definition, we have:

$$(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})(U) := Ker(\mathcal{O}_X(U) \longrightarrow \underline{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}(\mathcal{N}(U), (\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{N}')(U))) \tag{5.12}$$

and hence any $\mathcal{I} \in [\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N}]$ must be a submodule of $(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})$. In particular, from (5.12) it is also clear that $(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N}) \in [\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N}]$. Thus, given any quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{I}'$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$ such that $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}'\ \forall\ \mathcal{I} \in [\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N}]$, we have $(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}'$. Hence $(\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N})$ is the sum of all submodules $\mathcal{I} \in [\mathcal{N}' : \mathcal{N}]$. □

Lemma 5.7. *Let X be a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and let $\mathcal{I}$ be a quasi-coherent submodule of $\mathcal{O}_X$. Let K be a field object in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Let F be a symmetric monoidal functor from $QCoh(X)$ to $K - Mod$. Then, if the induced map $F(\mathcal{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X)$ is an epimorphism in $K - Mod$, it must be an isomorphism.*

Proof. Since F is a symmetric monoidal functor, we know that $F(\mathcal{O}_X) = K$. We set $L := F(\mathcal{I})$. Then, it is clear that L is a (not necessarily unital) commutative monoid object in $K - Mod$ and we have an epimorphism $f : L \longrightarrow K$ in $K - Mod$. It follows from Lemma 4.5 that $Hom_{K-Mod}(K, f) : Hom_{K-Mod}(K, L) \longrightarrow Hom_{K-Mod}(K, K)$ is a surjection. We choose any $u : K \longrightarrow L$ such that u is mapped to the identity map $K \longrightarrow K$ by this surjection $Hom_{K-Mod}(K, f)$. We now consider the following two commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{I} & \\
\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{I} \arrow[u] \arrow[r] & \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{I} \arrow[ul]
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
L & \\
L \otimes_K L \arrow[u] \arrow[r] & K \otimes_K L \arrow[ul]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the diagram on the right is obtained by applying the symmetric monoidal functor F. Since $f \circ u = id$ as mentioned above, the composition $K \otimes_K L \xrightarrow{u \otimes_K 1_L} L \otimes_K L \xrightarrow{f \otimes_K 1_L} K \otimes_K L$ is also the identity. Then we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& L & \\
K \otimes_K L \arrow[ur, "\cong"] \arrow[r, "u \otimes_K 1_L"'] & L \otimes_K L \arrow[u] \arrow[r, "f \otimes_K 1_L"'] & K \otimes_K L \arrow[ul, "\cong"']
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.13}$$

From (5.13), it follows that L is actually a unital commutative monoid in $K - Mod$ with unit morphism $u : K \longrightarrow L$. Therefore, the following composition is identical to the isomorphism $L \otimes_K K \cong L$:

$$L \otimes_K K \xrightarrow{1_L \otimes_K u} L \otimes_K L \xrightarrow{f \otimes_K 1_L} K \otimes_K L \xrightarrow{\cong} L \tag{5.14}$$

Since $(1_K \otimes_K u) \circ (f \otimes_K 1_K) = (f \otimes_K 1_L) \circ (1_L \otimes_K u)$, it follows from (5.14) that $f \otimes_K 1_K : L \otimes_K K \longrightarrow K \otimes_K K$ is a monomorphism. Then, the morphism $f : L \cong L \otimes_K K \xrightarrow{f \otimes_K 1_K} K \otimes_K K \cong K$ is also a monomorphism. Since f is already an epimorphism, we now know that f is an isomorphism. □

Proposition 5.8. *Let X be a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and let K be a field object in $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Let F be a cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functor from $QCoh(X)$ to $K - Mod$. Then, there exists $U \in ZarAff(X)$ such that if $\mathcal{I}$ is a quasi-coherent* *submodule of* $\mathcal{O}_X$ *with* $\mathcal{I}|_U = \mathcal{O}_X|_U$*, the functor* F *maps the monomorphism* $\mathcal{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ *to an isomorphism.*

Proof. Let $\{U_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ be an affine Zariski cover of X. Suppose that for each i, there exists a quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{I}_i$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$ such that $\mathcal{I}_i|_{U_i} = \mathcal{O}_X|_{U_i}$ and $F(\mathcal{I}_i) \longrightarrow F(\mathcal{O}_X) = K$ is not an epimorphism. Since K is a field object, it follows that $F(\mathcal{I}_i) = 0$. We now consider the direct sum $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i$ and the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$. Since each $F(\mathcal{I}_i) = 0$ and the morphism $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ factors through $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i$, we see that the composition $F(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i) \longrightarrow F(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i) \longrightarrow F(\mathcal{O}_X) = K$ is 0. Further, from the proof of Proposition 3.1, we know that $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i \longrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i$ is an epimorphism. Since F preserves small colimits (and hence preserves cokernels), $F(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i) \longrightarrow F(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i)$ is an epimorphism. It now follows that $F(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i) \longrightarrow F(\mathcal{O}_X) = K$ is 0.

On the other hand, we see that for any given $1 \leq j \leq n$, the composition $\mathcal{O}_X|_{U_j} = \mathcal{I}_j|_{U_j} \longrightarrow (\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i)|_{U_j} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X|_{U_j}$ is an isomorphism. Hence, $(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i)|_{U_j} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X|_{U_j}$ is an epimorphism for each j. Since the $\{U_i\}_{1\leq i\leq n}$ form a cover of X, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ is also an epimorphism and therefore $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{O}_X$. This contradicts the fact that the morphism $F(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i) \longrightarrow F(\mathcal{O}_X) = K$ is 0. Therefore, there exists at least one $1 \leq i_0 \leq n$ such that for any quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$ with $\mathcal{I}|_{U_{i_0}} = \mathcal{O}_X|_{U_{i_0}}$, $F(\mathcal{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X)$ is always an epimorphism. Combining with the result of Lemma 5.7, we see that $F(\mathcal{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X)$ is actually an isomorphism for any such $\mathcal{I}$.

□

Lemma 5.9. *Let* $\mathcal{N}$ *be a quasi-coherent sheaf on* X *and let* $\mathcal{M}$*,* $\mathcal{M}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{M}_2$ *be quasi-coherent submodules of* $\mathcal{N}$*. Let* $\mathcal{I}$ *be a quasi-coherent submodule of* $\mathcal{O}_X$ *such that the morphisms* $\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$*,* $\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{M}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ *factor through* $\mathcal{M}$*. Then, the morphism* $\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} (\mathcal{M}_1 + \mathcal{M}_2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ *factors through* $\mathcal{M}$*.*

Proof. We choose $Spec(A) = U \in ZarAff(X)$ and set:

$$I := \mathcal{I}(U) \qquad M_1 = \mathcal{M}_1(U) \qquad M_2 := \mathcal{M}_2(U) \qquad M := \mathcal{M}(U) \qquad N := \mathcal{N}(U) \tag{5.15}$$

Then, the morphisms $I \otimes_A M_1 \longrightarrow N$, $I \otimes_A M_2 \longrightarrow N$ factor through M. We will show that $I \otimes_A (M_1 + M_2) \longrightarrow N$ factors through M. We now consider the composition

$$Ker(I \otimes_A (M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow I \otimes_A N) \longrightarrow I \otimes_A (M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow N \tag{5.16}$$

Since the composition $I \otimes_A (M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow N$ coincides with $I \otimes_A (M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow I \otimes_A N \longrightarrow N$, the composition in (5.16) is 0. Since $M \longrightarrow N$ is a monomorphism, this implies that

$$Ker(I \otimes_A (M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow I \otimes_A N) \longrightarrow I \otimes_A (M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow M \tag{5.17}$$

is 0. Composing with the canonical morphism $I \otimes_A Ker((M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow N) \longrightarrow Ker(I \otimes_A (M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow I \otimes_A N)$, we see that

$$I \otimes_A Ker((M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow N) \longrightarrow I \otimes_A (M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow M \tag{5.18}$$

is 0. Then, (5.18) implies that there is a natural morphism

$$\begin{aligned} I \otimes_A (M_1 + M_2) &\cong I \otimes_A Coker(Ker((M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow N) \longrightarrow M_1 \oplus M_2) \\ &\xrightarrow{\cong} Coker(I \otimes_A Ker((M_1 \oplus M_2) \longrightarrow N) \longrightarrow I \otimes_A (M_1 \oplus M_2)) \longrightarrow M \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

□

Proposition 5.10. *Let X be a Noetherian, quasi-compact and semi-separated scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and let K be a field object. Let F be a cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functor from $QCoh(X)$ to $K - Mod$. Let $U \in ZarAff(X)$ be such that for any quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$ with $\mathcal{I}|_U = \mathcal{O}_X|_U$, F maps the monomorphism $\mathcal{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ to an isomorphism. Then, if $g : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is a monomorphism in $QCoh(X)$ such that $g|_U : \mathcal{M}|_U \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}|_U$ is an isomorphism, the functor F maps g to an isomorphism $F(g) : F(\mathcal{M}) \xrightarrow{\cong} F(\mathcal{N})$.*

Proof. From Theorem 3.9, it follows that $\mathcal{N}$ can be expressed as a filtered direct limit of its finitely generated quasi-coherent submodules $\{\mathcal{N}_i\}_{i \in I}$. Since each $\mathcal{N}_i$ is finitely generated, it follows from Proposition 5.6(a) that we can consider the quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{I}_i := (\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{N}_i)$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$ for each i. Further, for any quasi-coherent submodule $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$, it follows from Lemma 5.9 that the morphism $\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N}_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ factors through $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if $\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} (\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}_i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ also factors through $\mathcal{M}$. In particular, this means that $\mathcal{I}_i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} (\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}_i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ factors through $\mathcal{M}$.

For the sake of convenience, we set $\mathcal{N}'_i := \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}_i$. It is clear that $\varinjlim_{i \in I} \mathcal{N}'_i = \mathcal{N}$. Further, since $g|_U : \mathcal{M}|_U \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}|_U$ is an isomorphism, we have $\mathcal{I}_i|_U = (\mathcal{M}|_U : \mathcal{N}_i|_U) = \mathcal{O}_X|_U$. Hence $F(\mathcal{I}_i) \cong F(\mathcal{O}_X) = K \in K - Mod$. We have noted before that $\mathcal{I}_i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N}'_i = \mathcal{I}_i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} (\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}_i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ factors through $\mathcal{M}$. Since F is a symmetric monoidal functor, we now have the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{I}_i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{M} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{M} \arrow[d, "\cong"'] & & F(\mathcal{I}_i) \otimes_K F(\mathcal{M}) \cong F(\mathcal{M}) \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[d] & F(\mathcal{M}) \arrow[d, "id"'] \\
& & \Rightarrow & & \\
\mathcal{I}_i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N}'_i \arrow[r] & \mathcal{M} & & F(\mathcal{I}_i) \otimes_K F(\mathcal{N}'_i) \cong F(\mathcal{N}'_i) \arrow[r] & F(\mathcal{M})
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.20}$$

From the right hand side diagram in (5.20), it follows that $F(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow F(\mathcal{N}'_i)$ is a monomorphism for each $i \in I$. On the other hand, we also have:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{I}_i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N}'_i \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{N}'_i \arrow[d, "\cong"'] & & F(\mathcal{I}_i) \otimes_K F(\mathcal{N}'_i) \cong F(\mathcal{N}'_i) \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[d] & F(\mathcal{N}'_i) \arrow[d, "id"'] \\
& & \Rightarrow & & \\
\mathcal{M} \arrow[r] & \mathcal{N}'_i & & F(\mathcal{M}) \arrow[r] & F(\mathcal{N}'_i)
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.21}$$

From the right hand side diagram in (5.21), it follows that $F(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow F(\mathcal{N}'_i)$ is also an epimorphism for each $i \in I$. Consequently, we have an isomorphism $F(\mathcal{M}) \xrightarrow{\cong} F(\mathcal{N}'_i)$ for each $i \in I$. Since F preserves colimits, it now follows that $F(\mathcal{M}) \cong \varinjlim_{i \in I} F(\mathcal{N}'_i) \cong F(\varinjlim_{i \in I} \mathcal{N}'_i) \cong F(\mathcal{N})$.

□

Proposition 5.11. *Let X be a quasi-compact, semi-separated and Noetherian scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Let K be a field object of $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and $F : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K - Mod$ be a cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functor. Then, there exists a Zariski open immersion $i : U \longrightarrow X$ with U affine such that F is i-local.*

Proof. Using Proposition 5.8, we can choose $i : U \longrightarrow X$ in $ZarAff(X)$ such that if $\mathcal{I}$ is a quasi-coherent submodule of $\mathcal{O}_X$ with $\mathcal{I}|_U = \mathcal{O}_X|_U$, then F maps the monomorphism $\mathcal{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$

to an isomorphism. We now consider a morphism $g : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ in $QCoh(X)$ such that $g|_U : \mathcal{M}|_U \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}|_U$ is an isomorphism. Then, in particular, if $g : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is a monomorphism, $F(g) : F(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow F(\mathcal{N})$ is an isomorphism as shown in Proposition 5.10

Alternatively, suppose that $g : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is an epimorphism such that $g|_U$ is an isomorphism. We now consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \mathcal{M} \arrow[dl, "id"'] \arrow[d, "i"] \arrow[dr, "id"] & \\
\mathcal{M} & \mathcal{M}' := lim(\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{g} \mathcal{N} \xleftarrow{g} \mathcal{M}) \arrow[l, "p_1"] \arrow[r, "p_2"'] & \mathcal{M}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.22}$$

where p_1, p_2 are the two canonical morphisms from the limit $\mathcal{M}'$ to $\mathcal{M}$. Since $p_1 \circ i = p_2 \circ i = id$, $i : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}'$ is a monomorphism. When restricted to U, g becomes an isomorphism and hence the restriction $i|_U$ is an isomorphism. From Proposition 5.10, it follows that $F(i) : F(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow F(\mathcal{M}')$ is actually an isomorphism. Then, since $p_1 \circ i = p_2 \circ i = id$, $F(p_1)$ and $F(p_2)$ are isomorphisms. We now consider the commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{M}' \arrow[r, "p_2"] \arrow[dd, "p_1"'] & \mathcal{M} \arrow[dd, "g"'] & & F(\mathcal{M}) \cong F(\mathcal{M}') \arrow[r, "F(p_2)"] \arrow[dd, "F(p_1)"'] & F(\mathcal{M}) \arrow[dd, "F(g)"'] \\
& & \Rightarrow & & \\
\mathcal{M} \arrow[r, "g"] & \mathcal{N} & & F(\mathcal{M}) \arrow[r, "F(g)"] & F(\mathcal{N})
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.23}$$

Since g is an epimorphism in the abelian category $QCoh(X)$, the cartesian square on the left is also cocartesian. Then, F being cocontinuous, the right hand square in (5.23) is also cocartesian and hence $F(g)$ is an isomorphism.

Finally, since any morphism $g : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ can be factorized as an epimorphism followed by a monomorphism, it follows from the above that if $g|_U$ is an isomorphism, $F(g)$ is an isomorphism in $K-Mod$. From the result recalled in Proposition 5.4(a), it follows that $F : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K-Mod$ is i-local.

□

Theorem 5.12. *Let X be a quasi-compact, semi-separated and Noetherian scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Let K be a field object of $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and $F : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K - Mod$ be a cocontinuous symmetric monoidal functor that is also normal. Then, there exists a morphism $f : Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$ such that $F \cong f^*$.*

Proof. From Proposition 5.11, we know that there exists $(i : U = Spec(A) \longrightarrow X) \in ZarAff(X)$ such that F is i-local. Since F is also normal, it follows from Definition 5.5 that there is a normal functor $(G^U, \tau^U) : A - Mod \longrightarrow K - Mod$ with $F \cong G^U \circ i^*$. Then $G^U \cong G^U \circ i^* \circ i_* \cong F \circ i_*$. From Proposition 5.4(b), we know that

$$Fun_{c\otimes}(QCoh(U), K - Mod) \underset{\circ i_*}{\overset{\circ i^*}{\rightleftarrows}} \{F' \in Fun_{c\otimes}(QCoh(X), K - Mod),\ i\text{-local}\} \tag{5.24}$$

is an equivalence of categories. Therefore, we have $G^U \in Fun_{c\otimes}(QCoh(U), K-Mod)$. Further, since A is Noetherian, it follows from Proposition 5.2 that there exists a morphism $g : A \longrightarrow K$ in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$ such that $G^U(M) = M \otimes_A K$ for any $M \in A-Mod$. If we continue to denote by g the opposite morphism $g : Spec(K) \longrightarrow Spec(A)$, we see that $G^U = g^* : QCoh(Spec(A)) = A-Mod \longrightarrow K-Mod = QCoh(Spec(K))$. Hence, $F \cong G^U \circ i^* = g^* \circ i^* \cong (i \circ g)^*$.

□

Conversely, given a morphism $f : Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$, it is clear that the pullback functor $f^* : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K-Mod$ is cocontinuous and symmetric monoidal. We conclude by showing that the functor f^* is also normal.

Theorem 5.13. *Let X be a quasi-compact, semi-separated and Noetherian scheme over $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$. Let K be a field object of $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ and let $f : Spec(K) \longrightarrow X$ be a morphism of schemes. Then, the functor $f^* : QCoh(X) \longrightarrow K-Mod$ is a cocontinuous, symmetric monoidal and normal functor.*

Proof. We have mentioned before that f^* is cocontinuous and symmetric monoidal. Let $(i : U = Spec(A) \longrightarrow X) \in ZarAff(X)$ be such that f^* is U-local. We now consider the fiber square:

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[r, "g"] \arrow[d, "h"'] & U = Spec(A) \arrow[d, "i"] \\ Spec(K) \arrow[r, "f"] & X \end{tikzcd} \tag{5.25}$$

In (5.25), $h : Y \longrightarrow Spec(K)$ is a Zariski open immersion. Since K is a field object, it follows from Proposition 4.9 that either $Y = Spec(0)$ or $h : Y \longrightarrow Spec(K)$ is an isomorphism.

Case 1: $Y = Spec(0)$: Let $\mathcal{O}_X$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_U$) be the structure sheaf of X (resp. U) as defined in (2.3). Then, since f^* is U-local and the morphism $\mathcal{O}_X \longrightarrow i_*\mathcal{O}_U$ is an isomorphism when restricted to U, $f^*(\mathcal{O}_X \longrightarrow i_*\mathcal{O}_U)$ must be an isomorphism in $K-Mod$. Then, $f^*i_*\mathcal{O}_U \cong f^*\mathcal{O}_X \cong K$. We now note that the family

$$\{W \times_X Spec(K) \longrightarrow Spec(K) | W \in ZarAff(X)\} \tag{5.26}$$

is a covering of $Spec(K)$. Hence, we can choose $W \in ZarAff(X)$ such that $W \times_X Spec(K) \neq Spec(0)$. Then, since K is a field object, we must have $Z := W \times_X Spec(K) \xrightarrow{\cong} Spec(K)$. Then, the pullback $f^*(i_*\mathcal{O}_U)$ of $i_*\mathcal{O}_U$ can be described as:

$$f^*(i_*\mathcal{O}_U) \cong (i_*\mathcal{O}_U)(W) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(W)} K \cong \mathcal{O}_X(W \times_X U) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(W)} K \tag{5.27}$$

On the other hand, we notice that:

$$\begin{aligned} (W \times_X U) \times_W Z &= (W \times_X U) \times_W (W \times_X Spec(K)) \\ &= (U \times_X Spec(K)) \times_{Spec(K)} (W \times_X Spec(K)) \\ &= Spec(0) \times_{Spec(K)} Spec(K) = Spec(0) \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

Now since $Z = Spec(K)$, combining (5.27) and (5.28), we see that

$$f^*(i_*\mathcal{O}_U) \cong \mathcal{O}_X(W \times_X U) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X(W)} K = 0 \tag{5.29}$$

which contradicts the fact that $f^*i_*\mathcal{O}_U \cong K$. Hence, it is not possible to have $Y = U\times_X Spec(K) = Spec(0)$.

Case 2: $h : Y \longrightarrow Spec(K)$ is an isomorphism: We may suppose that h is actually the identity. Then, from (5.25), we see that $f = i\circ g$ and hence $f^* \cong g^*\circ i^*$. Since $g : Y = Spec(K) \longrightarrow Spec(A)$ corresponds to a morphism in $Comm(\mathcal{C})$, it is clear that g induces a normal functor $(g^*, \tau) : A - Mod \longrightarrow K - Mod$. Hence, the result follows.

□

References

[1] A. Banerjee, The relative Picard functor on schemes over a symmetric monoidal category. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **135** (2011), no. 4, 400–419.

[2] A. Banerjee, Centre of monoids, centralisers, and localisation. *Comm. Algebra* **40**, No. 11, 3975–3993 (2012).

[3] A. Banerjee, Noetherian schemes over abelian symmetric monoidal categories, arXiv:1410.3212 [math.AG]

[4] A. Banerjee, Schémas sur les catégories abéliennes monoïdales symétriques et faisceaux quasi-cohérents, *J. Algebra* **423** (2015), 148–176.

[5] M. Brandenburg, A. Chirvasitu, Tensor functors between categories of quasi-coherent sheaves. *J. Algebra* **399** (2014), 675–692.

[6] A. Connes, C. Consani, Schemes over $\mathbb{F}_1$ and Zeta functions, *Compos. Math.* **146** (6) (2010) 1383–1415.

[7] A. Connes, C. Consani, On the notion of geometry over $\mathbb{F}_1$, *J. Algebraic Geom.* **20** (3) (2011) 525–557.

[8] A. Connes, C. Consani, Absolute algebra and Segal's Gamma sets, arXiv:1502.05585 [math.AG].

[9] G. Cortiñas, C. Haesemeyer, M. E. Walker, C. A. Weibel, Toric varieties, monoid schemes and cdh descent, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **698** (2015), 1–54.

[10] A. Deitmar, Schemes over $\mathbb{F}_1$, in: Number Fields and Function Fields–Two Parallel Worlds, in: *Progr. Math.*, vol. **239**, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2005, pp. 87–100.

[11] P. Deligne, Catégories tannakiennes, in: The Grothendieck Festschrift, vol. II, in: *Progr. Math.*, vol. **87**, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990, pp. 111–195.

[12] B. Eckmann, P. J. Hilton, Group-like structures in general categories. I. Multiplications and comultiplications, *Math. Ann.*, **145**, 227–255 (1961/62)

[13] J. Flores, C. A. Weibel, Picard groups and class groups of monoid schemes, *J. Algebra* **415** (2014), 247–263.

[14] P. Freyd, Abelian categories: An introduction to the theory of functors, Harper & Row (1964).

[15] G. A. Garkusha, Grothendieck categories. (Russian) *Algebra i Analiz* **13** (2001), no. 2, 1–68; translation in *St. Petersburg Math. J.* **13** (2002), no. 2, 149–200.

[16] A. Grothendieck, Eléments de géométrie algébrique. I. Le langage des schémas, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* (1960), no. 4, 228.

[17] A. Grothendieck, Eléments de géométrie algébrique. I. Le langage des schémas, *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften in Einzeldarstellungen*, **166**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971.

[18] M. Hakim, Topos annelés et schémas relatifs, *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*, Band **64**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1972.

[19] M. Hovey, Cotorsion pairs and model categories. Interactions between homotopy theory and algebra, 277–296, *Contemp. Math.*, **436**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

[20] G. Laumon, L. Moret-Bailly, Champs algébriques, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000

[21] D. Lazard, Autour de la platitude, *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, **97** (1969) 81–128.

[22] J. Lurie, Derived algebraic geometry, PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2004.

[23] S. Mac Lane, Categories for the Working Mathematician, Second Edition, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, **5**, Springer, 1998.

[24] I. Pirashvili, On Cohomology and vector bundles over monoid schemes, *J. Algebra*, **435** (2015), 33–51.

[25] M. Prest, A. Ralph, Locally finitely presented categories of sheaves of modules, Manchester Institute for Mathematical Sciences Eprint 2010.21, University of Manchester (2010).

[26] M. Prest, A. Ralph, On sheafification of modules, Manchester Institute for Mathematical Sciences Eprint 2010.22, University of Manchester (2010).

[27] M. Prest, Definable additive categories: purity and model theory. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **210** (2011), no. 987.

[28] D. Rydh, Noetherian approximation of algebraic spaces and stacks *J. Algebra* **422** (2015), 105–147.

[29] D. Rydh, Approximation of sheaves on Algebraic stacks, arXiv: 1408.6698v2 [math.AG].

[30] C. Soulé On the field with one element (exposé à l'Arbeitstagung, Bonn, June 1999), Preprint IHÉS, 1999.

[31] C. Soulé, Les variétés sur le corps à un élément, *Mosc. Math. J.* **4** (1) (2004) 217–244.

[32] B. Stenström, Rings of quotients, *Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Band **217**, An introduction to methods of ring theory. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1975.

[33] B. Toën, G. Vezzosi, Homotopical algebraic geometry. I. Topos theory, *Adv. Math.* **193** (2) (2005) 257–372.

[34] B. Toën, G. Vezzosi, Homotopical algebraic geometry. II. Geometric stacks and applications, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **193** (902) (2008).

[35] B. Toën, M. Vaquié, Au-dessous de *Spec*($\mathbb{Z}$), *J. K-Theory* **3** (3), (2009) 437–500.

[36] A. Vezzani, Deitmars versus Toën-Vaquiés schemes over $\mathbb{F}_1$, *Math. Z.* **271** (2012), 911–926

[37] E. M. Vitale, Monoidal categories for Morita theory, *Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle Catég*, **33** (4) (1992) 331–343.